Every friend of immigration restriction should immediately request their two Senators to insist on the Burnett Immigration bill being voted on at this session of Congress.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

WEEKLY NEWS LETTER

Entered as second-class matter September 16, 1913, at the Postoffice at Washington, D. C., under the act of August 24, 1912.

Every friend of immigration restriction should immediately request their two Senators to insist on the Burnett Immigration bill being voted on at this session of Congress.

VOL. 6. NO. 2. WASHINGTON, D. C., SATURDAY, APRIL 8, 1916. WHOLE NO. 262.

HOUSE PASSES BURNETT IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION BILL: 307 TO 87

Railroad Officials Pay Secret Salaries

Cleveland, April 8.—In a statement issued by the publicity bureau of the four railroad brotherhoods, these leaders challenge the right of railroad officials that train service employes receive stupendous wages.

"The railroads give a list of a dozen or so engineers and conductors who receive fancy pay. These men, by reason of certain choice limited passenger runs, are held up as examples of what the train service men receive. As a matter of fact, they are exceptional cases and are not fair examples of what the train service men receive. The present eight-hour day movement does not embrace the passenger train service—only freight men; therefore, it is not proper to use any passenger service men as illustrations."

While discussing the claims of alleged high wages paid by railroads, the brotherhoods' bureau turns the managers' guns on themselves by making public the enormous salaries and secret contributions made to managers. Report No. 6,834, of the United States interstate commerce commission, shows methods employed by the Rock Island railroad. First Vice President J. E. Gorman "was secretly paid $18,750 per annum, making his total compensation $42,750, whereas the pay roll showed $25,000."

C. A. Morse, chief engineer, received an annual salary of $15,000 and a secret bonus of $2,000 on the first of each year.

Upon the retirement of R. A. Jackson as general solicitor he was given $100,000 in cash.

F. Lorez, chairman of the executive committee, had a joint contract with that company and the St. Louis & San Francisco railroad which provided for an annual salary of $75,000 for five years, and a bonus of $500,000 at the expiration of the contract. After 10 months' service, the companies wanted to be released from this contract and "he was given bonds of the railway company of a par value of $450,000." This was borne by the two companies and the Rock Island's proportion was charged to profit and loss.

Robert Mather, vice president of the Rock Island, was given $25,000 in cash, while George T. Boggs, another official, was given $15,000 cash when he retired.

The report makes this conclusion:

"The contributions to officials of the railway company in excess of their salaries aggregated about a million dollars."

The brotherhoods' bureau makes this statement:

"From the above report of the United States interstate commerce commission, whose methods employed by the Rock Island railroad. First Vice President J. E. Gorman "was secretly paid $18,750 per annum, making his total compensation $42,750, whereas the pay roll showed $25,000."

C. A. Morse, chief engineer, received an annual salary of $15,000 and a secret bonus of $2,000 on the first of each year.

Upon the retirement of R. A. Jackson as general solicitor he was given $100,000 in cash.

F. Lorez, chairman of the executive committee, had a joint contract with that company and the St. Louis & San Francisco railroad which provided for an annual salary of $75,000 for five years, and a bonus of $500,000 at the expiration of the contract. After 10 months' service, the companies wanted to be released from this contract and "he was given bonds of the railway company of a par value of $450,000." This was borne by the two companies and the Rock Island's proportion was charged to profit and loss.

Robert Mather, vice president of the Rock Island, was given $25,000 in cash, while George T. Boggs, another official, was given $15,000 cash when he retired.

The report makes this conclusion:

"The contributions to officials of the railway company in excess of their salaries aggregated about a million dollars."

The brotherhoods' bureau makes this statement:

"From the above report of the United States interstate commerce commission it is plain that railroad payrolls do not always show what the officials actually receive. There is no question as to the railroads' ability to meet the demands for an eight-hour day if the funds, which in the past have been diverted to their proper uses, are allowed to remain in the treasuries of the railroads to meet the necessary expenditures of running railroads as business institutions."

TOLEDO CAR MEN STRIKE.

Toledo, Ohio, April 8.—Because the members of the newly-organized Street Car Men's union insisted on wearing the button of their organization a strike has tied up transportation service in this city. The men have agreed to arbitrate every question but their right to organize and wear their button. The company says the buttons cause the public to "insult" the non-union car workers, and the conductors ask if the public does not to the car barns and crawls under the cars to investigate the standing of car starters, and other workers who are included in the company's edict.

City officials have applied to Judge Killets of the United States federal court for a receiver on the ground that the company owes the city money and that it has suspended the operation of its service because of differences with employes, "thereby paralyzing the business and social activities of the city of Toledo."

PAINTERS RAISE WAGES

Tiffin, Ohio, April 8.—The Painters' union has secured recognition and raised wages from 22 1-2 and 25 cents to 30 cents an hour. Time and one-half will be paid for overtime and Sunday work. This scale has been generally signed by contractors.

CHILD LABOR LAW NO HARDSHIP

Philadelphia, April 8.—Contrary to the assertions of its opponents, the new child labor law has not caused the hardships predicted. The law provides that every child between the age of 14 and 16 employed in an industry shall have eight hours' schooling every week. According to Henry Gideon, chief of the bureau of compulsory education, the claims of the Manufacturers' association and other opponents of this legislation have proven unfounded. The number of children leaving school and seeking employment certificates so far this year is 3,100 against 4,000 issued in corresponding months last year. According to Mr. Gideon, if the present rate of reduction is maintained, between 7,000 and 8,000 children who would have left school under the old law will remain in school because of the provisions of the new law.

BRANDEIS FAVORED.

Washington, April 8.—By a vote of three to two the committee of the senate judiciary committee has indorsed the appointment of Louis D. Brandeis for the position of associate justice of the United States supreme court. The appointment will next be considered by the full committee.

OHIO ANTI-TRUST LAW CAN'T APPLY TO LABOR

Youngstown, Ohio, April 8.—Common Pleas Judge Anderson's decision in quashing indictments against the United States Steel Corporation and five other steel concerns will strengthen labor's campaign in this state against the injunction process, which is based on the old dictum that labor is a commodity.

The steel companies were charged with conspiring to regulate the wages of common labor, in violation of the state anti-trust law, which declares it shall be unlawful to combine for the purpose of affecting commerce or commodities.

In discussing the terms "commerce" and "commodities," Judge Anderson said:

"Labor must come within one of these terms before the combination in that respect can be deemed to be unlawful. Does it? No one will contend that it comes within 'commerce.' While the indictment distinctly charges in several places that labor is a commodity, and avers that the (the steel companies) were guilty of entering into an unlawful combination because labor was a commodity, yet this cannot be true. When we take the definition of 'trade' as used in this statute, we find that it simply means the same as 'commodity.' There is but little distinction between the two words. I am not prepared now, and I trust I never shall be, to declare that the labor of a man is a commodity to be hocked in the market and to be sold to the highest bidder.

"Labor is personal and individual to the man. It is his; it is his own; no one can sell it for him in this land of ours, nor can any one take it from him.

"The statute itself (anti-trust law), it seems to me, absolutely precludes labor from its terms. It is not dealing with wages or labor; it makes no provision that it is a violation of law for the mill owners to combine to fix the price of labor. The lawmakers are endeavoring by this act to prevent the citizens of Ohio being injured by a combination that might fix prices of goods and merchandise and products sold in the market. This is the object of the statute, and nothing else.

"Then, again, what would be the result if it were held that labor comes within this statute? Every labor union throughout the state would be violating the law at every meeting when they are endeavoring to protect one another as to their wages, and all of their acts would be criminal.

"Labor does not come within this statute and was not contemplated by it. It was not a crime for the mill owners to combine to fix the price of wages, so that this crime attempted to be charged in the indictments is no crime whatever and the words there contained are mere surplusage."

CHICAGO TRIBUNE STATES CASE.

Chicago, April 8.—The Chicago Tribune is one of the very few large newspapers in this country that is fearless enough to state the forces for and against the Burnett immigration bill. In an editorial last week, this paper said:

"The literacy test has just one purpose—that is, to reduce immigration into this country.

"Opposition to the literacy test has just one purpose—to prevent any limitation of immigration into this country.

"Proponents of the literacy test believe that the time has come when we must slow up the inrush of foreign blood, in order to allow the nation to assimilate the multitude of strange races now within its borders and in order to limit the competition of pauper labor, which is more and more bearing upon American born workingmen.

"Opponents of the literacy test desire a broader labor market or they desire to open the benefits of America to foreigners, let the consequences to Americans be what they may.

"People favoring the literacy test wish to reduce immigration into America. People opposing it wish an unrestricted flow of foreigners, literate or illiterate."

PROSECUTOR DENIES CLAIM.

Youngstown, Ohio, April 8.—In opposing the motion in Judge Anderson's court that indictments against the steel companies be quashed, Prosecuting Attorney Henderson insisted that he had no intention of classifying labor as a commodity. He said such an argument was astounding as coming from attorneys representing corporations that have done more than any one else to make labor a commodity. "As far as I am concerned," he continued, "in the interest of humanity I would rather have this court hold that labor is not a commodity. Corporations have enjoined labor unions. Union labor does not make secret agreements to get higher wages.

"This indictment is not directed against the payment of higher wages. It is directed to prevent corporations from combining to keep down wages. It puts the hand of bad faith upon the corporations when they claim that these indictments are aimed at union labor. Union labor is not to restrain commerce. Union labor seeks to obtain a just distribution of wealth. The combination of the corporation is to create a monopoly."

"REWARDS" FAITHFUL MEN.

Washington, April 8.—The Washington Railway & Electric company, one of the two street car companies in this city that was forced to increase wages because of a recent two days' strike of its motormen and conductors, has "rewarded" employes who did not strike. Each shopman and mechanic who remained at work was given $5, $10 to shopmen who ran cars and $25 to every motorman and conductor who did not join the strike.

UNION LABEL AND SERVICE TRADES DEPARTMENT

VOTE ON RESTRICTION IN HOUSE ANALYZED

Washington, April 8.—An analysis of the house vote on immigration restriction, March 30, indicates an increasing demand for this legislation.

Out of a possible 434 votes in the house, only 87 were cast against the bill, 26 were recorded "not voting" and 3 "present." Of these 29 only 12 were paired against the passage of the bill. There was not a single vote against the bill from the following 26 states: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia and Wyoming.

Eighteen states were divided in their vote, but in none of these was a majority of the congressmen against the bill.

In only four states—Connecticut, Michigan, New York and Rhode Island—did a majority of the delegations vote against the bill on final passage. In these cases the vote was: Connecticut, 4 out of 5 against or were paired against; Michigan, 7 out of 13; New York, 27 out of 43; Rhode Island, 2 out of 3.

Rhode Island was the only state whose entire delegation either voted or was paired against the bill, 2 voting nay and 1 being paired to vote nay.

But one-fifth of the total membership of the house voted against the bill, which passed by nearly a four to one vote by congressmen free from the people, just a year and two months after the President's veto of the same bill, January 28, 1915, when the chief executive stated that he doubted whether there was a popular demand for this legislation.

ONLY PRACTICAL TEST OFFERED

Toledo, Ohio, April 8.—The Toledo Blade, in these few words, sums up the agitation for and against the Burnett immigration restriction bill:

"The literacy test for immigrants has never been advertised as perfect. In operation, it would turn back many aliens who might become worthy citizens. But so other test that promises to restrict immigration in a practical way has been suggested.

"The advocates of this measure are trying only to slow down the stream of foreigners who, for so many years, poured through our gates. The opponents of the test do not offer a substitute. And for a very good reason. They are not really troubled, as they profess to be, lest an occasional healthy and intelligent, though illiterate, alien be refused admittance. Their concern is lest the supply of cheap labor be restricted."

Washington, April 8.—By a vote of 307 to 87 the house passed the Burnett immigration bill, with the literacy test, on Thursday, March 30. Prior to this vote, Congressman Sabath moved to recommit the bill "with instructions" to strike out the literacy test. This was defeated on a roll call vote, 284 to 107.

Opponents of the measure presented no new arguments, while the position of its advocates was strengthened by conditions in Europe because of the war. Congressman Mann, the minority leader—who voted for the Sabath amendment, but later voted for the bill—indorsed this position. He said: "And unless those countries (European) by their own legislation can prevent their citizens coming here, we are liable to have a flood of immigration such as no country in the world ever experienced before. I am not willing to take the chances on it."

Advocates of restriction referred to the increasing sentiment in favor of greater effectiveness in every field of activity. They insisted that democracy cannot be developed to its highest possible point while we encourage the admission of illiterates who destroy living standards of American labor and who refuse to become a part of our national life.

The literacy test provides that immigrants over 16 years of age must read at least 30 words in some language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish, chosen by the immigrant. Exceptions to this test are made in the case of an immigrant's father or grandfather over 55 years of age; his wife, his mother, his grandmother, or his unmarried or widowed daughter.

Exception to the literacy test is also made where an immigrant flees from religious or political persecution. The latter exception includes "persons convicted, or who admit the commission, or who teach and advocate the commission, of an offense purely political." Under this provision the old-world revolutionist who advocates force to overthrow his government, or who admits the use of force for that purpose, will be admitted to this country regardless of educational qualifications.

The question of immigration restriction by a literacy test has been favorably voted on by almost every congress since 1896. On three occasions the proposal has been vetoed—by Presidents Cleveland, Taft and Wilson. In 1897 the house passed the bill over President Cleveland's veto, 193 to 37. This was 37 votes more than the necessary two-thirds vote. The senate failed to act, owing to a rush of business and congress adjourning a few hours after the house vote.

In 1913 the senate passed the bill over President Taft's veto, 72 to 18, but the veto was sustained in the house by a few votes. On Feb. 4, 1915, the house sustained President Wilson's veto, 261 to 136. If any four of the 136 that voted to sustain the President had voted with the majority a two-thirds vote would have been secured and the bill passed.

The last vote in favor of immigration restriction—307 to 87, recorded March 30, last—indicates the increasing demand by the people for this legislation.

The bill is now in the senate. Its passage by that body is conceded if its advocates can overcome the small minority that will take advantage of the rules of the senate to keep the bill from being voted on.

Trade unionists and other friends of this legislation are urged to write their two United States senators and insist that the Burnett immigration bill be voted on at this session of congress.

WIRE MEN STRIKE.

Johnstown, Pa., April 8.—The Citizens' Electric and Gas Appliance company, the leading electrical concern in this city, attempted to increase hours and reduce wages, and as a result is minus its union electrical workers.

The Lathers' union has prepared a new wage scale, to take effect the first of next month.

RUBBER WORKERS RAISE WAGES

Trenton, N. J., April 8.—As the result of a strike at the Ajax rubber plant, wages are increased 2 1-2 cents an hour, and about 100 additional employes have joined the Soft Rubber Workers' union.

LARGE LOCOMOTIVE ORDER.

Philadelphia, April 8.—The Baldwin locomotive works has secured orders totaling $1,350,000 for locomotives. Twenty-five of the locomotives, which are of the heavy freight type, will be built for the Pennsylvania railroad and an equal number of the same sort for the Great Northern railroad.

FULL CREW LAW REMAINS

Albany, N. Y., April 8.—The railroad committee of the state assembly has refused to favor Assemblyman Nickerson's proposal to repeal the full crew law, passed in 1913.

HOUSE ROLL CALL VOTE ON BURNETT IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION BILL

ALABAMA.

Aye. Abercrombie, Almon, Hinckmon, Burnett, Grey, Heflin, Huddleston, Oliver, Steagall

Nay.

Not Voting. Dent.

ARIZONA.

Aye. Hayden

Nay.

Not Voting.

ARKANSAS.

Aye. Craway, Goodwin, Jacoway, Taylor, Tillman

Nay.

Not Voting. Oldfield, Wingo

Wingo was paired in favor of the passage of the Immigration Bill, with Curry of Wisconsin against.

CALIFORNIA.

Aye. Church, Curry, Elston, Hayes, Kent, Kettner, Nolan, Raker, Randall, Stephens

Nay. Kahn

Not Voting.

COLORADO.

Aye. *Keating, Taylor, Timberlake

Nay.

Not Voting. Hilliard

Hilliard was paired in favor of the passage of the Immigration bill with Loud of Michigan against.

CONNECTICUT.

Aye. Hill

Nay. Freeman, Glynn, Oakey

Not Voting. Tilson

Tilson was paired against the passage of the Immigration bill with Edwards of Georgia in favor of the passage of the Immigration bill.

DELAWARE.

Aye. Miller

Nay.

Not Voting.

FLORIDA.

Aye. Clark, Sears, Sparkman, Wilson

Nay.

Not Voting.

GEORGIA.

Aye. Adamson, Bell, Crisp, Howard, Hughes, Lee, Park, Tribble, Vinson, Wise

Nay.

Not Voting. Edwards, Walker

Edwards was paired in favor of the passage of the Immigration bill with Tilson of Connecticut against.

IDAHO.

Aye. McCracken, Smith

Nay.

Not Voting.

ILLINOIS.

Aye. Buchanan, Chindblom, Dooley, Denison, Foss, Fuller, King, McKenzie, McKinley, *Mann, Rainey, *Rodenberg, Sterling, Tavenner, Wheeler, Williams, T. S., Wilson

Nay. Britten, Channon, Gallagher, McAndrews, McDermott, Madden, Sabath, Stone.

Not Voting. Williams, W. E.

INDIANA.

Aye. Adair, Cline, Cox, *Cullop, Dixon, *Gray, Moores, Moss, *Rauch, *Wood

Nay. Barnhart, Lieb

Not Voting. Morrison

IOWA.

Aye. Dowell, Good, Green, Haugen, Hull, Kennedy, Ramseyer, Steele, Sweet

Nay. Towner, Woods

Not Voting.

KANSAS.

Aye. Anthony, Ayres, Campbell, Connelly, Doolittle, Helvering, Shouse, *Taggart

Nay.

Not Voting.

KENTUCKY.

Aye. Barkley, Cantrill, Fields, Helm, Johnson, Kinchelow, Langley, Powers, Rouse, Thomas

Nay. Sherley

Not Voting.

LOUISIANA.

Aye. Aswell, Lazaro, Morgan, Wilson

Nay. Dupre, Estopinal, Martin

Not Voting. Watkins

MAINE.

Aye. Hinds, Peters

Nay.

Not Voting. Guernsey, McGillicuddy

McGillicuddy was paired against the passage of the Immigration bill with Guernsey in favor.

MARYLAND.

Aye. Linthicum, *Mudd, Price, Talbott

Nay. Coady

Not Voting. Lewis

Lewis was paired in favor of the passage of the Immigration bill with Doremus of Michigan against.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Aye. Gardner, Gillett, Olney, *Rogers, *Treadway

Nay. Carter, Dallinger, Gallivan, Greene, Paige, Phelan, Roberts, Tague, Tinkham, Walsh, Winslow

Not Voting.

MICHIGAN.

Aye. Hamilton, Keller, McLaughlin, Mapes, Scott, Smith

Nay. Beakes, Crainton, Fordney, James, Nichols

Not Voting. Doremus, Loud

Doremus was paired against the passage of the Immigration bill with Lewis of Maryland in favor. Loud was paired against the passage of the Immigration bill with Hilliard of Colorado in favor.

MINNESOTA.

Aye. Anderson, Davis, Ellsworth, Lindbergh, Miller, Schall, *Smith, Stenerson, Van Dyke, Volstead

Nay.

Not Voting.

THE VOTE EXPLAINED.

Prior to the final vote on the immigration restriction bill, Congressman Sabath moved to strike out the literacy test. This was defeated on a roll call vote, 284 to 107.

The bill was then passed by the vote printed herein.

The names in the "Aye" columns, with a star (*) at their left, indicates that these members first voted to strike out the literacy test, and when the motion to strike out was defeated, these members voted for the bill on its final passage.

MISSISSIPPI.

Nay.

Not Voting.

Aye. Candler, Collier, Harrison, Humphreys, Quin, Simon, Stephens, Venable

MISSOURI.

Nay.

Not Voting. Booher, Dyer, Igoe, Metcker, Shackleford

Aye. Alexander, *Borland, Decker, Dickinson, Hamlin, Henslee, Lloyd, Rubey, Rucker, Russell

Booher answered "present."

Igoe answered "present."

Dyer was paired in favor of the passage of the Immigration bill with Igoe against.

Meeker was paired in favor of the passage of the Immigration bill with Booher against.

Champ Clark—Speaker—not recorded.

MONTANA.

Nay.

Not Voting. Stout

Aye. Evans

NEBRASKA.

Nay. Lobeck

Not Voting.

Aye. Kinkaid, Reavis, Shallenberger, *Sloan, Stephens

NEVADA.

Nay.

Not Voting.

Aye. Roberts

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Nay.

Not Voting.

Aye. Sulloway, Wason

NEW JERSEY.

Nay. Bacharach, Eagan

Not Voting. Hamill, Hart, Scully

Aye. Browning, Capstick, Drukker, Gray, Hutchinson, Leibach, Parker

Hamill was paired against the passage of the Immigration bill with Young of Texas in favor.

Hart was paired in favor of the passage of the Immigration bill with Graham of Pennsylvania against.

Scully was paired against the passage of the Immigration bill with Rowland of Pennsylvania in favor.

NEW MEXICO.

Nay.

Not Voting.

Aye. Hernandez.

NEW YORK.

Nay. Bennet, Bruckner, Caldwell, Carew, Chandler, Conry, Dale, Dooling, Driscoll, Farley, Fitzgerald, Flynn, Gould, Griffin, Haskell, Hulbert, Loft, London, Maher, Oglesby, Patten, Riordan, Rowe, Sanford, Siegel, Smith, Swift

Not Voting. Fairchild, Platt

Aye. Charles, Danforth, Dempsey, Dunn, Hamilton, Hicks, Husted, Magee, Mott, Parker, Pratt, Snell, Snyder, Ward

NORTH CAROLINA

Aye. Britt, Daughton, Godwin, Hood, Kitchin, Page, Pou, Small, Stedman, Webb

NORTH DAKOTA.

Nay. Norton

Not Voting.

Aye. Helgesen, Young

OHIO.

Nay. Crosser, Gordon, Sherwood

Not Voting.

Aye. Allen, Ashbrook, Brumbaugh, Cooper, Emerson, Fess, Gard, Hollingsworth, Kearns, Key, Longworth, McCulloch, Matthews, Mooney, Overmeyer, Ricketts, Russell, Switzer, Williams

OKLAHOMA.

Nay.

Not Voting.

Aye. Carter, Davenport, Ferris, Hastings, McClintic, Morgan, Murray, Thompson

OREGON.

Nay.

Not Voting.

Aye. Hawley, McArthur, Sinnott

PENNSYLVANIA.

Nay. Barchfeld, Casey, Liebel, Moore, Morin, Vare.

Not Voting. Darrow, Dewalt, Edmonds, Graham, Griest, McFadden, Rowland

Aye. *Bailey, Beales, Butler, Coleman, Costello, Crago, Dupre, Focht, Garland, Heaton, Hogwood, Keister, Kless, Kreider, Lafean, Lesher, Miller, North, Porter, Scott, Steele, Temple, Watson

PENNSYLVANIA (Continued).

Graham was paired against the passage of the Immigration bill with Hart of New Jersey in favor.

Griest was paired in favor of the passage of the Immigration bill with Edmonds against.

Rowland was paired in favor of the passage of the Immigration bill with Scully of New Jersey against.

RHODE ISLAND.

Aye.

Nay.

Not Voting. Kennedy, O'Shaunessy, Stiness

Stiness was paired against the passage of the Immigration bill with Henry of Texas in favor.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Nay.

Not Voting.

Aye. Aiken, Byrnes, Finley, Lever, Nicholls, Ragsdale, Whaley.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Aye. Dillon, Gandy, Johnson

Nay.

Not Voting.

TENNESSEE.

Aye. Austin, Byrns, Houston, Hull, McKellar, Moon, Padgett, Sells, Sims

Nay.

Not Voting. Garrett

TEXAS.

Aye. Black, Callaway, Davis, Dies, Eagle, Garner, Gregg, McLemore, Rayburn, Slayden, Smith, Stephens, Sumners

Nay. Burgess, Buchanan, Hardy

Not Voting. Henry, Young

Henry was paired in favor of the passage of the Immigration bill with Stiness of Rhode Island against.

Young was paired in favor of the passage of the Immigration bill with Hamill of New Jersey against.

UTAH.

Aye. Mays

Nay.

Not Voting.

VERMONT.

Aye. Dale, Greene

Nay. Howell

Not Voting.

VIRGINIA.

Aye. Carlin, Flood, Glass, Hay, Holland, Jones, Montague, Slemp, Watson

Nay.

Not Voting. Saunders

WASHINGTON.

Aye. Bill, Hadley, Humphrey, Johnson, La Follette

Nay.

Not Voting.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Aye. Cooper, Littlepage, Moss, *Neely, *Sutherland

Nay.

Not Voting.

WISCONSIN.

Aye. Browne, *Cooper, *Esch, Frear, Lenroot, Nelson

Nay. Burke, Kopp, Reilly, Stafford

Not Voting. Carry

Carry was paired against the passage of the Immigration bill with Wingo of Arkansas in favor.

WYOMING.

Aye. Mondell

Nay.

Not Voting.

A SYNOPSIS OF SPEECHES FAVORING IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION BILL

Eloquent Congressmen Shatter Cheap Labor Defenders Who Compare the Last Century With This Age of Compulsory Education, Increasing Democracy and Higher Living Standards.

Mr. Burnett, Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, it is strange that when gentlemen come to discuss this question, instead of discussing it dispassionately so many of them undertake to make flings at the chairman of the committee and the section of the country from which I hail. Gentlemen have animadverted on the literacy conditions in a section of the country—the south. Those conditions have been deplorable, but that was not of the seeking of the people in my country; and was it not and is it not what is left of the south's illiteracy due to our unfortunate, servile labor? And therefore ought not the south qualify as an expert with reference to illiteracy in immigrants?

My memory goes back to the sixties and the early seventies, when I know how hard the struggle was for my people to keep the wolf from the door. I know that every boy or girl who could lift a hoe handle or follow a plow was requisitioned for the purpose of aiding in the support of our starving people. I know the conditions of their schoolhouses, because I attended those schools when in the cold blasts of winter the winds were whistling through the cracks of the log cabin schoolhouses in my native state.

It was amid such conditions, Mr. Chairman, that many grew up who are now adult illiterates. But conditions are changing, and changing rapidly, and those poor men and women are learning to read and write in those localities where illiteracy so long prevailed.

But, Mr. Chairman, instead of that being an argument against the illiteracy test in this bill, it seems to me that with the large number of illiterates whom we already have in our country we certainly do not want the millions of illiterates of other lands and other climes, to whom we are not obligated, to come here for the purpose of adding to our illiteracy and depriving our people of an education. We of the southland feel we have all the illiteracy that we can struggle with for decades to come.

Gentlemen have elaborated on the education that the second generation of these aliens get, and on down to the third generation. Gentlemen, education is right for men who toil, women and children who are dependent on the laboring men of this country, to suffer starvation in order to wait for the second generation? It is the first generation, Mr. Chairman, that is bringing about the trouble all over this land. It was the first generation at Youngstown a few weeks ago that brought about that riot that the distinguished member of Congress from that district has spoken of. It was that generation that drove out thousands of Americans, native and naturalized. Surplus men were kept there by the steel barons, as was testified before the strike commission in this city, two men were kept for every job. Men, heads of families—and we have the records here—worked for $200 a year and had to support a family on that small amount. Sanitary conditions brought about by such a low standard of wages and low standard of living thus set up were such that it drove out the toilers, with the result that property was destroyed, men were murdered, riot ensued. Over 71 per cent of these people being from the southern part of Europe and practically every one of this surplus of cheap, servile labor that illiterate test would have kept out of the country and thus tended to prevent such an awful state of affairs.

Gentlemen, this bill stands up and strengthens far more than our laws have ever been tightened and strengthened along that line. But suppose that were true, and we do not claim that the literacy test will keep them out. It is not proposed to substitute the tests for keeping out educated criminals, literate insane, and other admittedly undesirables. The bill keeps them out, and, gentlemen, the reading test will keep out hundreds and thousands of people who are such easy tools and pliant dupes in the hands of the literate Black Hand leader, under the padrone system, under the boss in the coal mines, and the corrupt ward heeler. Gentlemen, if you want to defeat this bill and desire to take the consequences, then you can take the sweet unction to your soul that you have thrust a dagger in the vitals of the men who toil. Talk about not being in favor of an illiteracy test and protecting labor by this legislation and yet having labor cards in their pockets and believing in the principles of organized labor!

My friends, when they say that the people of northwestern Europe will not do the work they ought to do—since 1885 I have been in favor of a high standard of wages, by inferior and lower conditions of living. It has not happened in the south, nor in the west. I heard my good friend from Minnesota, and North Dakota, while a member of my committee a few years ago, resent the imputation that the splendid Scandinavian citizenship throughout the west would not do the work. He said they did do it until some boss of cheap foreign laborers came and established a standard of living and a condition of wages that no decent white man could compete with. That is what happened. You talk about the textile mills all over the country, and child labor. Go with me to my home —and, by the way, gentlemen have sought to inject the child-labor question. Gentlemen, I have always been in favor of laws in that regard. I was specifically paired for the child-labor bill recently and I voted for the bill creating the children's bureau. I voted for the child-labor bill last session. Why, sir, I was but a boy, as member of the state legislature, in 1884, when we passed the first child-labor law that any state in the Union had, people came from Massachusetts and asked to establish cotton mills in Alabama, and asked me to sign a petition to the Alabama legislature to repeal it. I said, "No, gentlemen; I helped to pass that law and I am not going to help repeal it."

The gentleman from New York (Mr. Bennet) talks about the people of Armenia being kept out. I read that sparecrow the other day in his speech. Why, sir, provide that those who are suffering from religious persecution, whether that persecution be manifested by overt acts, positive laws, or regulations, shall not be prevented by an illiteracy test? Sir, I am impressed with that specious kind of argument that the gentleman is so much given to, undertakes to say that the steamship companies would not receive them, because they would be afraid they would be turned back on them when they got over here.

Mr. Meeker, Missouri.

Kingdoms, monarchies, and despotisms may continue with an illiterate population; democracies can not. Where the government rests upon the people it may be better if they are not literate, but where the government is the people we must have not simply intelligence but literacy if we expect to maintain our institutions. I am not here to say for one moment that there are not and have not been many of men born and reared in this country, and others who have come to this country, just as good in character and otherwise as some who were able to read; but the plea of the man who defends illiteracy, if taken out of the logical conclusion, would mean the closing of every schoolhouse on every hillside in our nation. You can not follow the argument to its logical analysis. You can not make your plea for the illiterate without making your plea for illiteracy at the same time. We are facing the question of how much illiteracy we can permit in this country and at the same time maintain our American institutions. The man who stands in the American congress and pleads for illiteracy, or the man who attempts to make this house or this nation believe that this bill as it is brought to the house will mean the shutting out of all who might apply for admission, misleads this house and misleads this nation. This is nothing more nor less than a selective program. It by no manner of means shuts out all who apply.

We are facing a question of policy. I will say to the gentleman from New York, if he can demonstrate that this does not admit a political refugee then I will vote for any amendment which he may bring that will provide it. I would never vote for any bill that would deny admission into this country of any man who is seeking his religious or political liberty; and if it is not provided in this bill, let us provide it now, before the bill becomes a law.

You can not get away from the fact that illiteracy means low wages. You can not deny it. If it is not true, then your educational program is a farce and a sham. You are either for it or against it, and when you come in with the specious plea that we have not been able to hold up wages in any particular state by the organized union-labor movement, you know, just as surely as you know that we are men on the floor of this house, that it is the illiterate man who can be used to lower wages, and not the man who reads. We hear much said about the foreigner. I wish to say right here that the illiterate alien is the only individual in our nation who can not be reached through any means or channel, and to whom information that is commonly used by men can not be brought.

I want to say to my friends this afternoon who, from different states, come on the floor of the house, and some one asks you about the literacy in your own state whether there may be in Missouri or Indiana or Illinois or Alabama or any other state—it is just that much of a black mark on what should be a clean record.

We get nowhere by pointing the finger of scorn at ourselves, if we have not been faithful in forwarding the educational program of our own people. You beg the question when you say, "How about these people at home; why not let the illiterates come from the outside?" The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Austin) is going to speak a little later, and he will give you some facts that I have taken from the Dillingham, but facts taken from the department, as to what the trend of illiteracy has been in this country since the bill was vetoed by our ex-President. It is well worth our while to stop and consider whether we should offer to the aliens of the old world carte blanche in coming into our country or whether we should put somewhat of a limitation upon coming. I want to say just in the closing moments that I have that I have grown somewhat impatient in the last few months hearing this constant appeal that Uncle Sam should always stand with open arms to one and all. We are always been asked to do the brotherly act. All the brotherly love and everything else is to come from our side.

I have heard men say on this floor that a certain group of men in Europe are fighting the battles of democracy. Oh, no; the battles of democracy are to be fought out in this nation and democracy does not need not boast about genuine democracy, for it is playing at the game. It is high time that we men in our own nation should begin to look primarily to the literacy of our people, for, without literacy, intelligence after all means but little. We men in this nation should look first to the interests of our people, and any measure that will strengthen the intellectual power of this nation should be welcomed by everybody. Any man who pleads for any other, certainly has not taken into consideration his people first.

A great contest is being waged against this bill, and I ought to say that all of the lobbying, as you call it, is not all from one side. Do not fool yourselves for a moment into thinking that there are not plenty of forces being brought to bear on both sides of this question. Those who desire to use the illiterate to glut the labor market are on the job.

Mr. Schall, Minnesota.

All the expert opinion of the last 30 years recommends this test as the only practical and feasible one to meet the conditions of today. The test is so simple that they who refuse our citizenship can not complain. All it requires is the first spark of enlightenment, an entering wedge, a feeble aspiration. Is our citizenship so despicable that the knowledge of a 7-year-old boy primarily to secure a price? Are our constitutional rights for which we have spent 140 years of treasure, of strife, and of blood so worthless that an alien should not be expected to give even that much of ocean voyage for them in learning to read three lines? This test is a test of disposition, of aspiration, of character, of energy. That is the real attitude, not as the opposition would have you believe, of literary achievement. Today when popular education, colleges, public schools, newspapers, books are in the reach of this country, but in all Europe, are the rule, I submit that to read 30 words in one's own language or dialect is in no sense a literacy test. The opposition tell you that you can not test a man's character until after he has lived and died. Thus they relegate this test to the next world. But, Mr. Chairman, the elements of successful judgment are foresight, not hindsight; not a post mortem, but a prospectus; not ancient history, but modern; not superstition, but science; not the procrastination of the ignorant, but the alertness of the enlightened citizen who maps your project and names your dividends before you invest a dollar.

Shall we legislate to guard the quality and character of the rod in the engine, the brick in the wall, to raise the standard of cotton and corn, to improve the breed of the cow and the hog, to ward against the scourge of the cotton boll and the smut in the wheat, to protect public health by rigid tests, and then proceed to overthrow it all by leaving open our gates and let the world's scum in? Of course not. We are not legislating for the seventeenth or the eighteenth or even the nineteenth century. We are legislating for the twentieth century, for the near 100 years beyond. We are not legislating for the colonial period, when public schools were almost unknown in the world. We are not legislating for the period of the American revolution, though the founders of this country must have believed that the safety of the republic rested upon the intelligence of the individual citizen, for they established our public school system in the same mortar in which they set our constitution. We are not legislating for the generation immediately following our civil war, when over 90 per cent of our immigration came from northern Europe—thrifty, alert, adventurous, energetic, courageous class of men, who easily became Americans, who had American ways, who respected American laws, and who loved American institutions, from the fisherman of Norway to the vine grower of France, who came here not at the behest of the agents of the great steamship companies, but left their own free will to carve out for themselves a future and conquer a wilderness. But, Mr. Chairman, the frontier is gone, and most of our natural resources, God's provision for the people, have passed into the hands of great corporations who control mines, mills, forests, fisheries, food products, and the railroads and traffic which they use to exploit, and who are today exploiting the people by on the one hand urging us to protect the products of their industries so that the toilers of this country may be protected from the products of cheap foreign labor and on the other hand are fighting this test, tooth and nail, that the cheap immigrant may be allowed to flock in, defeat the just demands of the intelligent American laborer.

Every form of our government today, gentlemen, rests upon standardization. Science, business, and government rest today upon foresight. The difference between ancient and modern civilization and civilization of the future is preparedness, foresight which reads the signs before the breaking of the storm, applies the acid test before the poison enters the system, the sifting, testing process which knows the quality and character of every stone, stick, lock, and bar that goes into the foundation and superstructure, anticipating the time of storm and shock.

Now, gentlemen, if science guards us against individual loss, why should we not employ it to guard us against national loss? We demand efficiency in every department except citizenship, upon which the whole fabric of our civilization stands. It is no kindness, gentlemen, to thrust upon people duties for which they have no understanding or means of understanding. It is unjust that the immigrant should exhibit capacity for citizenship or at least an intelligent desire for it? Today, when public schools, newspapers penetrate even darkest Africa, is it unjust that the immigrant shall show some spark of aspiration, some inclination toward enlightenment?

Is it unjust to the boy who expects to graduate high school that he first know the common branches? Is it unjust to the workman who wants employment in a trade that he should have served an apprenticeship? Why, gentlemen, this test asks less of an alien seeking a life job as an American than any office in this country would ask of a 20-year-old native-born voter.

Give us a sign, brother, that we may know you understand or have the means of understanding; that we may know that you have left behind you the outcry that we would soon have no cheap labor. To me that is no objection. I would be glad to have no cheap labor, for I know that with the cheap labor the cost of living would be relatively increased. The more equal distribution of wealth should be one of our chief aims.

It might check our invasion of the markets of the world. But by our tariff laws we could preserve and assure to ourselves our own markets, even if we had to surrender other markets to cheap labor. It is more important to Americanize and spiritualize our own population than to extract wealth from other nations.

There never has been a time when we could so well afford to let the rest of the world and devote ourselves to building up our own character and independence. Hundreds of millions of American securities have drifted here during the past year. But with all of that we are still a debtor nation our obligation can not be large. The world is in turmoil, and no one can foresee the conditions which will prevail at peace. It may be that the heavy taxation elsewhere will equalize higher wages here. We know it will not be prudent to be defenseless, and we are about to extend our armaments, and our navy and our army. It will be safe or fruitful time to preach or practice world-wide philanthropy when all other nations are battering themselves into unconditional surrender. Why should we not then study our own interests, set our own house in order, raise our standards of citizenship, and for a period admit no dilution and initiate a devotion to our own people? Then we would very likely make ourselves a better instrument to assist and stimulate the advancement of the whole world. "If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he is worse than an infidel."

Mr. Cooper, West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, released from the schools of the states at the age of 16, thousands of the youth of the land will be forced by economic pressure into the mills, mines, and manufacturing plants of the nation to "earn bread by the sweat of their faces," educated to at least the limit required by state and national law, capable, both mentally and physically, to meet successfully the problems of life; I ask in the name of justice, in the name of right, in the name of humanity, are we not bound to shield boy by boy, perhaps your boy, who have followed the rules and regulations written into law by the lawmakers of the nation, to keep open wide the doors of this country to the ignorant labor of Europe when it is well known these men from Europe will be freely admitted to the mills, mines, and manufacturing plants of the nation to work side by side by side with our boys, putting in peril their lives, and when it is well known an ignorant brain can and will in the end destroy, not only himself, but perhaps every one of his fellow workmen?

We see the states passing rigid mining laws; we see laws on the statute books of the states requiring a certain proficiency in the miner before a man be permitted to work in a coal mine; yet we see the laws of the national government allowing ignorance and poverty freely admitted into our fair land to nullify and make of no legal force the good work being undertaken by the state mining departments, the bureau of mines, and the safeguarding provisions necessary on state and federal research; but as long as ignorance and poverty are allowed to come to America and make their home, we shall continue to see the coal and the manufacturing products of our nation washed in blood. I make the assertion without fear of successful contradiction more lives are sacrificed today in the coal mines of America through ignorance than through the ordinary hazards which are likely to occur in any coal mine, and this ignorance is manifested through failure or inability to read and study the rules and regulations, and thereby be better able to avoid danger and peril by following the rules and regulations written by men of experience. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

Mr. Austin, Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, the most serious, vital, and far-reaching question involved here—and it is above party, above religion, above class—is the enormous increase in our population. We increased by immigration 2,545,707 in 24 months—1913 and 1914—prior to the present war in Europe. We have now 30 people to the square mile.

The Russian empire has 20, Italy 51, Germany 60, and England over 300. I made a trip through Japan last summer, and there are 525,000 Japanese women and girls working in textile mills for from 8 to 15 cents a day. Skilled mechanics in Japan, in the steel mills, in the railroad shops, in the factories, arsenals, and so forth, are receiving the highest wage paid, and that is 37½ cents for a day's work. Now, under the existing conditions in this land feel a deep and earnest interest in this proposed legislation. Coming to keep our doors wide open and the time will come when we will have the same conditions here that they have in Italy, where they work longer hours for low wages; just as they are doing in Germany, in Poland, in Hungary, in Austria, in China, in Japan, and in other countries, where they work for one-third and as low as one-tenth of what is paid in the American workshops. Keep the doors wide open and the ceaseless tide of immigration to our shores, and our women will work for from 8 to 15 cents a day in the textile mills of America, and skilled mechanics will labor longer hours at lower or starvation wages. The standard of living will be lowered, will be a thing of the past. No wonder the faithful engineer at the throttle appeals to our patriotism; no wonder the representative of 3,000,000 of organized labor appeals to our sense of danger to the American wage earner; no wonder not only organized but unorganized labor is urging the passage of this bill. You may stop it, you may halt it, you may delay it, by an unpatriotic veto or otherwise, but the American people are determined to write it on the statute books.

No man will ever again be elected President of the United States who does not pledge his support to legislation of this kind. Never again will we choose a President who thinks more of the men who live beyond the ocean than he does of the American freemen, American workingmen, and American firesides.

Mr. Neely, West Virginia.

It appears from evidence of record, and with which all the members of this body are familiar, that the opposition to the passage of a bill containing the literacy test has been fathered and financed by the shipping trust that fattens on the fares paid by the immigrants for transportation, and by various other trusts that employ these helpless and unhappy people for wages for which the American standard of living cannot possibly be maintained.

The competition of immigrant labor with our own has become so pernicious and notorious that employment bureaus are established in the leading centers of any nationality, in any number and in any state, for wages lower than those paid to workmen who are natives of the state. It is a most iniquitous system as this is to swell the army of the unemployed with those of our own flesh and blood.

We spend $50,000,000 annually for education. Shall we at such a cost to the American people, and then permit it to be imported wholesale from abroad? Shall we prepare our own people for the responsibilities and duties of citizenship at an expense of half a million dollars a year and at the same time freely permit those to come into our midst who have had no preparation at all?

We have no grudge or grievance against the illiterate people of other lands. As they are unfortunate, we sympathize with them; as they are poverty stricken, we pity them; as they are oppressed, we weep for them; but as they would be a burden to our own children our own taxpayers, and lower our own standard of life, we are obliged to exclude them. Our task is an unpleasant one, but wisdom assigns it, reason commends it, duty commands its performance, and patriotic legislators must obey.

If we are charged with being selfish in passing this bill, we shall remind those who make the charge that while our action may prove an immediate hardship to the illiterate foreigner, it will ultimately reveal itself to the classes from which the charge arises. For when the peasants of Europe know that they cannot come into the United States until they have learned to read some language, then schoolhouses will be built as if by magic in every community of the peasantry of Europe, and to the fertile valleys of the Tiber and the Po. Teachers will be multiplied and elementary education will become the chief object of every child, and ignorance, even in the most benighted province of Europe, will be no more.

By passing this bill we shall place a new value on American citizenship; we shall protect the American laborer, secure the American standard of wages, and preserve the American ideal of civilization.

Mr. Vinson, Georgia.

strengthening of our present immigration law with a literacy test, have no thought as to the effect upon American labor that this influx of ignorant immigrants may have in reducing the standard of American ideals, American politics, American labor, and American citizenship. Nothing is further from their minds. These corporations, secure in the possession of the wealth, the individuals who constitute them, as well as their families and caste associates, have no fear of any undesirable effect from such a source, in so far as they themselves are concerned. They are members of the moneyed aristocracy of America; they expect that they and their posterity will ever be above association with the classes that will be affected.

Were it possible for these moneyed lords and barons, these plutocrats, who desire cheap labor, they would have the laws repealed that excludes Chinese and Japanese coolies. What shocks your sense of justice in admitting to welcoming the ignorant immigrants of Europe, open wide the doors of admission to the hordes of Asiatic coolies. What matters it to them the standard of American wages, the standard of American ideals, the standard of American citizenship, and the standard of American politics. Greed and vanity predominate their every sense, and to them the indefinite economic conditions are those that would reduce the great mass of the country's wage earners to such a condition of subjection and servitude as to make them ready to do servile homage to the wealthy few. Those who in America who are benefited by the invasion of these undesirable, ignorant, criminal, and vicious immigrants are those who employ them at a lower wage than they would have to pay for American labor.

Mr. Coleman, Pennsylvania.

Of course this is a departure from the established policy of this nation, but it is not the only departure of recent times from the ways and methods of the fathers. Oh, that we a grand speech by a grand old man (Mr. Cannon) delivered in this house yesterday, but conditions have changed in recent years and these changed conditions demand new laws. Who 20 years ago would have proposed in this house such taxation laws as are now enforced? Who would have advocated such pronounced federalism as is now practiced

(Continued on Page Three.)

POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS REFUGEES ARE NOT BARRED

The Burnett immigration restriction bill makes clear provision for the continued admission of political and religious refugees to this country.

Opponents of the bill evade discussing the main purpose of this legislation—to maintain American living standards of workers by debarring illiterates.

As it is unwise to combat this principle, the trusts and other cheap labor advocates insist that the act would change America's traditions and nullify the laws which we are forced to leave the old world because of political or religious beliefs.

The following sections of the bill, however, completely refute these claims:

"That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to-wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the secretary of labor that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence, whether such persecution be evidenced by overt acts or by laws or by governmental regulations that discriminate against the alien or the race to which he belongs because of his religious faith.

"Nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted or who admit the commission, or who teach or advocate the commission, of an offense purely political."

Congressman Burnett, author of the bill, and chairman of the house committee on immigration, has repeatedly stated that the friends of immigration restriction would not support legislation that would debar these refugees.

Other advocates of restriction have taken a similar position, which is in line with the immemorial humanitarian declarations of the American Federation of Labor, and which was pointed out by Congressmn Meeker of Missouri who made this answer to the claim of anti-restrictionists:

"You speak of the political refugee. If the language is not distinct and plain on that one issue, then I cannot understand how it is to be written. The revolutionist, your Kossuths, and all those men to whom reference has been made, could enter this country under this provision. This country will always remain the home of the religious and the political refugee, but we would just as well begin now to face that other problem of imported ignorance."

Mr. Johnson, Washington.

All who have given the matter any thought agree that if restriction of immigration is not now actually enacted there will soon be no need for such a step must be taken. Nearly all of those who appeared at the hearings of the house committee on immigration and naturalization in opposition to this bill admitted that the time must come when the United States shall cease to be an asylum for the oppressed peoples of all the world. Others admit that the time has arrived for restriction, but contend that the literacy test is not the best method to adopt in order to curtail the hordes that were pouring in for a number of years prior to the outbreak of the European war, and who will again, in my opinion, come pouring in at the conclusion of that fearful struggle.

The opposition to the literacy test seems based on sentiment chiefly—except, of course, the opposition of those who, for various reasons, oppose all restriction of immigration, and find the literacy test a convenient peg upon which to hang their opposition. But, as those who at first blush reject the literacy test as unfair, study the question, they find it not only fair, but the best test of all, we must have some method. The percentage restriction will not do for it will admit liberal numbers of all the oriental races, races with which we cannot assimilate, and which we all agree should not be permitted to secure a further foothold in the states of this Union. An excessive head tax is not desirable, as it is subject to more objection than this simple, so-called literacy test, which requires aliens coming in to be able to read 30 to 40 words in his native language or jargon—40 simple words in any tongue the new arrival may select.

The bill exempts grandfathers and fathers beyond a certain age. It exempts the young. It permits to be enfranchised the children who come in if they cannot read even one single word. Can any restrictive test be as fair? The danger is, in my opinion, that the test will not be sufficient to keep out the hopeful and hopeless who wish. But it is a step toward restriction, and if enacted into law it will mean those nonpersecuted persons who cannot read one single line will not enter for America. The steamships will not bring them. It will stop the influx from that great area around Constantinople. But even those, if persecuted, can come.

Mr. Gillett, Massachusetts.

All of Europe is just now selfish and belligerent. The time is peculiar and out of joint. "America first" is just now a good watchword, and it is a question whether it is not best for the future of the world that we do well and be free from wars to protect ourselves for a time against the further dilution of our citizenship.

Of course, prohibiting immigration even temporarily involves disadvantages. There would be a outcry that we would soon have no cheap labor. To me that is no objection. I would be glad to have no cheap labor, for I know that with the cheap labor the cost of living would be relatively increased. The more equal distribution of wealth should be one of our chief aims.

It might check our invasion of the markets of the world. But by our tariff laws we could preserve and assure to ourselves our own markets, even if we had to surrender other markets to cheap labor. It is more important to Americanize and spiritualize our own population than to extract wealth from other nations.

There never has been a time when we could so well afford to let the rest of the world and devote ourselves to building up our own character and independence. Hundreds of millions of American securities have drifted here during the past year. But with all of that we are still a debtor nation our obligation can not be large. The world is in turmoil, and no one can foresee the conditions which will prevail at peace. It may be that the heavy taxation elsewhere will equalize higher wages here. We know it will not be prudent to be defenseless, and we are about to extend our armaments, our navy and our army. It will be safe or fruitful time to preach or practice world-wide philanthropy when all other nations are battering themselves into unconditional surrender. Why should we not then study our own interests, set our own house in order, raise our standards of citizenship, and for a period admit no dilution and initiate a devotion to our own people? Then we would very likely make ourselves a better instrument to assist and stimulate the advancement of the whole world. "If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he is worse than an infidel."

Mr. Wilson, Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation proposed in this bill, in substance and spirit, has been before congress for many years and has established a record and made a history that is unique in legislative annals. Fierce battles have been fought over its provisions, the literacy test being and constituting the chief cause of contention and the storm centers around which the controversy has raged since 1896. In 1896 the house and senate passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test. It was vetoed by President Cleveland. The house passed the bill over the President's veto, it failed in the senate by the expiration of the congress. In 1898 a like bill passed the senate, but was not considered by the house on account of the Spanish-American war. In 1902 the house of representatives passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test. In 1906 the senate passed an immigration bill containing the same test. When the matter reached the house the federal immigration commission was created as a substitute for the pending bill. This commission consisted of nine members, who, after a very thorough investigation of the immigration question both in this country and in Europe, by a vote of 8 to 1, settled upon the literacy test as the most satisfactory and practical means of restricting, limiting, and regulating immigration.

In 1913 the senate and house adopted and passed a bill embodying the recommendations of the immigration commission and containing the literacy test. President Taft vetoed this bill, which passed the senate over the President's veto, but failed in the house by only a few votes.

In 1914 the house and senate, by large majorities in each body, passed a like immigration bill, which was vetoed by President Wilson, and which failed in the house to pass over the veto by a few votes.

Therefore the literacy test has been indorsed by one or both branches of congress six times during the past 20 years, and in all instances has failed to pass over the veto of the various Presidents by a very small majority. In view of this record, it might be asked if any legislative proposition has ever been more thoroughly considered or so often indorsed by the American people through their representatives in congress? The question has been asked if any political party has ever committed itself to this particular proposition. In the Democratic platform of 1896 the following appears:

"We believe that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market."

It is generally conceded and acknowledged after the most thorough investigation that the literacy test is the best means by which this may be accomplished. It is true that the Democratic party and its candidates were not successful in 1896, but it was certainly not due to this declaration in the platform that defeat overtook Democracy in that year, as the following plank appeared in the Republican platform of 1896:

"For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and the wages of our workingmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor, we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write."

The wage earners of this country plead for the enactment of this bill into a law, not through any feeling or spirit of antagonism toward the laborers or peoples of other countries, but for the protection of those of their own country, already here.

Mr. Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, in his statement before the immigration committee, gives the position of organized labor upon this question, as follows:

The wage earners believe in an effective regulation of immigration because they desire to retain the American standard of living. The standard of wages for both skilled and unskilled labor in this country is the result of many years of effort by organized labor. When an immigrant accepts work at less than the standard wage he not only takes the place of the man working at the higher rate, but he assists in forcing downward the prevailing rate of wages in that industry, which result carries with it a corresponding reduction in the material, moral, and intellectual standard of American life.

Mr. Austin, Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, the most serious, vital, and far-reaching question involved here—and it is above party, above religion, above class—is the enormous increase in our population. We increased by immigration 2,545,707 in 24 months—1913 and 1914—prior to the present war in Europe. We have now 30 people to the square mile.

The Russian empire has 20, Italy 51, Germany 60, and England over 300. I made a trip through Japan last summer, and there are 525,000 Japanese women and girls working in textile mills for from 8 to 15 cents a day. Skilled mechanics in Japan, in the steel mills, in the railroad shops, in the factories, arsenals, and so forth, are receiving the highest wage paid, and that is 37½ cents for a day's work. Now, under the existing conditions in this land feel a deep and earnest interest in this proposed legislation. Coming to keep our doors wide open and the time will come when we will have the same conditions here that they have in Italy, where they work longer hours for low wages; just as they are doing in Germany, in Poland, in Hungary, in Austria, in China, in Japan, and in other countries, where they work for one-third and as low as one-tenth of what is paid in the American workshops. Keep the doors wide open and the ceaseless tide of immigration to our shores, and our women will work for from 8 to 15 cents a day in the textile mills of America, and skilled mechanics will labor longer hours at lower or starvation wages. The standard of living will be lowered, will be a thing of the past. No wonder the faithful engineer at the throttle appeals to our patriotism; no wonder the representative of 3,000,000 of organized labor appeals to our sense of danger to the American wage earner; no wonder not only organized but unorganized labor is urging the passage of this bill. You may stop it, you may halt it, you may delay it, by an unpatriotic veto or otherwise, but the American people are determined to write it on the statute books.

No man will ever again be elected President of the United States who does not pledge his support to legislation of this kind. Never again will we choose a President who thinks more of the men who live beyond the ocean than he does of the American freemen, American workingmen, and American firesides.

Mr. Neely, West Virginia.

It appears from evidence of record, and with which all the members of this body are familiar, that the opposition to the passage of a bill containing the literacy test has been fathered and financed by the shipping trust that fattens on the fares paid by the immigrants for transportation, and by various other trusts that employ these helpless and unhappy people for wages for which the American standard of living cannot possibly be maintained.

The competition of immigrant labor with our own has become so pernicious and notorious that employment bureaus are established in the leading centers of any nationality, in any number and in any state, for wages lower than those paid to workmen who are natives of the state. It is a most iniquitous system as this is to swell the army of the unemployed with those of our own flesh and blood.

We spend $50,000,000 annually for education. Shall we at such a cost to the American people, and then permit it to be imported wholesale from abroad? Shall we prepare our own people for the responsibilities and duties of citizenship at an expense of half a million dollars a year and at the same time freely permit those to come into our midst who have had no preparation at all?

We have no grudge or grievance against the illiterate people of other lands. As they are unfortunate, we sympathize with them; as they are poverty stricken, we pity them; as they are oppressed, we weep for them; but as they would be a burden to our own children our own taxpayers, and lower our own standard of life, we are obliged to exclude them. Our task is an unpleasant one, but wisdom assigns it, reason commends it, duty commands its performance, and patriotic legislators must obey.

If we are charged with being selfish in passing this bill, we shall remind those who make the charge that while our action may prove an immediate hardship to the illiterate foreigner, it will ultimately reveal itself to the classes from which the charge arises. For when the peasants of Europe know that they cannot come into the United States until they have learned to read some language, then schoolhouses will be built as if by magic in every community of the peasantry of Europe, and to the fertile valleys of the Tiber and the Po. Teachers will be multiplied and elementary education will become the chief object of every child, and ignorance, even in the most benighted province of Europe, will be no more.

By passing this bill we shall place a new value on American citizenship; we shall protect the American laborer, secure the American standard of wages, and preserve the American ideal of civilization.

Mr. Vinson, Georgia.

strengthening of our present immigration law with a literacy test, have no thought as to the effect upon American labor that this influx of ignorant immigrants may have in reducing the standard of American ideals, American politics, American labor, and American citizenship. Nothing is further from their minds. These corporations, secure in the possession of the wealth, the individuals who constitute them, as well as their families and caste associates, have no fear of any undesirable effect from such a source, in so far as they themselves are concerned. They are members of the moneyed aristocracy of America; they expect that they and their posterity will ever be above association with the classes that will be affected.

Were it possible for these moneyed lords and barons, these plutocrats, who desire cheap labor, they would have the laws repealed that excludes Chinese and Japanese coolies. What shocks your sense of justice in admitting to welcoming the ignorant immigrants of Europe, open wide the doors of admission to the hordes of Asiatic coolies. What matters it to them the standard of American wages, the standard of American ideals, the standard of American citizenship, and the standard of American politics. Greed and vanity predominate their every sense, and to them the indefinite economic conditions are those that would reduce the great mass of the country's wage earners to such a condition of subjection and servitude as to make them ready to do servile homage to the wealthy few. Those who in America who are benefited by the invasion of these undesirable, ignorant, criminal, and vicious immigrants are those who employ them at a lower wage than they would have to pay for American labor.

Mr. Coleman, Pennsylvania.

Of course this is a departure from the established policy of this nation, but it is not the only departure of recent times from the ways and methods of the fathers. Oh, that we a grand speech by a grand old man (Mr. Cannon) delivered in this house yesterday, but conditions have changed in recent years and these changed conditions demand new laws. Who 20 years ago would have proposed in this house such taxation laws as are now enforced? Who would have advocated such pronounced federalism as is now practiced

(Continued on Page Three.)

Insist That the Same Provisions in Bill Before Congress Adjourns

WHY THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT URGES IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION

As a people we have barely begun to appreciate the value of those qualities which make for real progress, the necessity to insist and persist in formulating sound policies to redound to the interests of the people of our nation. Indeed, for years we have delayed in even formulating a national policy that would protect us against such elements and conditions which act as a barrier to the development of American character and national unity. We have excused this delay on the ground that we were a young nation; that we had vast public lands and national resources that must be developed, and that we could afford to open our doors to a practically unrestricted immigration in order to increase our population.

But conditions have changed. We are no longer a young nation. We have wasted much of our national heritage and the frontier has practically disappeared. Recent events that have tested national institutions and men's faith to the uttermost, proved conclusively that we cannot hope to be the ideal which America represents, we cannot maintain a place of influence in the affairs of the world, if we do not plan to carry out those purposes. Haphazard development may do well enough for the ordinary activities from day to day but will not endure the tests of a great crisis or the slower test of time.

To achieve the best that is possible for our nation, and for our citizens generally, we cannot escape the duty devolving upon us of thinking out a national policy that will develop out of the many peoples within our boundaries a homogeneous nation bound together by common ideals, common customs, common language and a common culture.

America has not yet become a nation. It is still a conglomerated mass of various and diverse ethnic groups. Hordes of immigrants have crowded into our ports, and have, for the most part, settled in the nearest industrial center. In some cases they have in masses moved farther inland to industrial centers where the nature of the work required comparatively little skill. In many of these cases, the coming of the immigrant has been to the activities of managers of industries, who arranged to secure the financial advantages by employing foreign workers who still retained the standards and prejudices of other countries. So we find in many industrial centers sections that are known as "Little Hungary," "Little Italy," etc. The inhabitants of these little nations transplant to American soil the institutions and the standards of their fatherlands. They gain nothing by coming. These communities speak a foreign language, read foreign papers, dress in accord with foreign customs and bring up their families in accord with foreign standards. There is practically no sustained effort on the part of society or the nation to assimilate these foreign groups and to make of them Americans. Nor is this condition confined only to the poorer immigrants. There are foreign communities in the resident districts of the large cities. These remain even more exclusively foreign because their wealth enables them to have foreign schools and foreign instruction for their children. Thus the foreign group and alien influence become rooted in the life of the community.

The workers of America have felt most keenly the pernicious results of the establishment of foreign standards of work, wages and conduct in American industries and commerce. Foreign standards of wages do not permit American standards of life. Foreign labor has driven American workers out of many trades, callings, and communities, and the influence of these lower standards has permeated widely.

For years the organized labor movement has called attention to these vicious tendencies which affect not only the workers but the whole nation, for national unity is weakened when the nation is honeycombed with "foreign groups" living a foreign life.

The labor movement has urged the adoption of a national policy that would enable us to select as future citizens of our country those who can be assimilated and made truly American. The American Federation of Labor has urged a literacy test, which shall be applied to all immigrants. Our nation has accepted as a fundamental principle that education enables the girl and boy to attain their development and to have better control over their own personal ability and powers. It has been our national purpose to eliminate from our country all illiteracy. It is, therefore, in accord with this general plan that we should establish the same requirements for foreign-born persons who desire to come and live in our country. It has been urged that this is not a perfect standard. Of course no standard is perfect but the literacy test is the most effective and practical. It has been claimed that our greatest criminals are often educated persons. These are, however, only conspicuous failures of education to achieve its desired ideal. Educated criminality is not the fault of education, but is the inherent fault or defect in the nature or the physical make-up of the individual. If it is urged that education tends to criminality it would seem the wisest course to remain in ignorance, a fallacy so patent that its mere statement carries with it its own repudiation. Education cannot remedy all the inherent faults of human nature, but it is the greatest instrumentality for human development and betterment.

It has been urged against the literacy test that this standard would make many suffer because they had been denied opportunities. That may be true, but it is equally true that our nation cannot work out all of the problems of all other nations. We cannot undertake to educate all of those to whom other countries deny educational opportunities. Each nation must undertake and solve its own educational problems. The adoption of the literacy test by our own country would have a tendency to force nations to establish more general educational opportunities for all of their people. It is only a half truth to say that the literacy test would close the gates of opportunity to illiterate foreigners. As a matter of fact there is very little opportunity for these people in our industrial centers. Usually they have been brought over here either by steamship and railroad companies and other greedy corporations, by employers, or as a result of collusion between employers. They have been brought over here for the purpose of exploitation, and until they develop powers of resistance and determination to secure things for themselves they have little opportunity here. These same qualities would secure for them within their own countries many of the advantages that later come to them here.

The section of the Burnett immigration bill which establishes the literacy test provides for no unfair requirements. It says:

"All aliens over sixteen years of age, physically capable of reading, who cannot read the English language, or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish; Provided, That any admissible alien, or any alien heretofore or hereafter legally admitted, or any citizen of the United States, may bring in or send for his father or grandfather over fifty-five years of age, his wife, his mother, his grandmother, or his unmarried or widowed daughter, if otherwise admissible, whether such relative can read or not, and such relative shall be permitted to enter. That for the purpose of ascertaining whether aliens can read, the immigrant inspectors shall be furnished with slips of uniform size, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, each containing not less than thirty nor more than forty words in ordinary use, printed in plainly legible type in some one of the various languages or dialects of immigrants. Each alien may designate the particular language or dialect in which he desires the examination to be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect."

An attempt has been made to create the impression that the literacy test will close America as a haven of refuge to political refugees and those persecuted because of religious faith. That this is wholly unwarranted in fact is evident from the following portion of the proposed act:

"That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor, that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution in the country of their last permanent residence, whether such persecution be evidenced by overt acts or by laws or by governmental regulations that discriminate against the alien or the race to which he belongs because of his religious faith. Provided, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted, or who admit the commission, of a purely political crime, or who advocate the commission, of an offense purely political."

The proposed legislation does not represent a radical change in the policy of our nation. It is an extension of our educational policy, and is in harmony with the conviction that has been growing recently that we, as a nation, must leave our haphazard methods of development behind, and inaugurate a definite sustained national policy that shall promote our best development, and shall co-ordinate and organize all of the resources of our country and plan for their best utilization.

Opposition to the literacy test and to any proposition to restrict immigration has come from steamship companies, steel corporations, coal operators and other employers whose financial interests were associated with the maintenance of large numbers of workers forced by their helplessness to work for low wages. The activities of these interests have been given a cloak of respectability by many who, for sentimental reasons, were unwilling to endorse any form of restriction of immigration. But selfish interest or sentiment that is contrary to the fundamental principles of national welfare cannot frustrate efforts to promote the best interests of our nation.

The meaning of America lies in the ideal she represents. That ideal is liberty and opportunity. But beautiful as any ideal may be, it becomes of practical value when it has effectiveness in the daily lives of men and women.

Real liberty and opportunity mean a certain mental attitude toward life, certain standards of life and work, and possession of that which secures the enjoyment of opportunities.

America the ideal—the land of the free—exists only when her people are Americans in all things.

Our nation has been founded and has sought together those from other lands who have sought our shores and to make of them homogeneous people—a nation with common ideals, common standards of living, a national language and an ideal national patriotism.

The building of a nation is not a thing of chance—it is the result of statesmanship, knowledge of tendencies, a discernment of cause and effect, ability to distinguish the good from the evil.

Too long our national policies have been determined by sentimental emotions, business profits and political expediency. But there must come a change. These months of terrible warfare have compelled a testing of things that have passed over. "The world is afire"—and we must put our own house in order lest we, too, be caught unawares. We must search out each weakness and strengthen every danger point.

The workers of America make the demand that there shall be restriction of immigration to such as can be readily identified and assimilated with Americans and can become truly American.

By President Gompers

In American Federationist

A SYNOPSIS OF SPEECHES FAVORING IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION BILL

(Continued from Page Two.)

by the professed followers of Thomas Jefferson? Who would have strenuously championed a national prohibition amendment? Who would have seriously advocated universal suffrage? All of these things are being done and they demonstrate how far and how fast we are traveling from the ancient landmarks. Possibly we members reached a point at which we might well pause before traveling farther from tried principles of representative government; but this cannot excuse the problem now.

Let me impress you with the fact that we are confronted with vastly different conditions which require vastly changed our position. A short time since we looked upon Europe as she grappled with her great social problems, with comparative indifference, as we felt her problems could never be ours. But today we are not only face to face with those social problems but are fast being carried into European militarism, from which God grant we may be spared. It was Carlyle who said, in effect, I do not pretend to quote his exact language: You may talk of your America and the prosperity you enjoy, but the secret of your success is that you have a great deal of land for very few people. Density of population has brought its problems to our doors, and to solve them prudence coupled with wisdom must be applied.

Mr. Fess, Ohio.

We spend three-quarters of a billion dollars per year on our common schools in order to remove this incubus. We find it not so much for the youth who come to the country. If the American born must not grow up in ignorance because of the state, then why should the state not protect itself against with open arms? Why should there be one standard for the native American and another for the foreigner?

I shall vote for the illiteracy test because it will select our immigrants. It will lift the standard of the foreigner. The one who comes to our shores should have a distinct purpose. If he comes to remain for a short time to take back his earnings to his native land than our own labor, he does not help American conditions by breaking down our standard. If he cannot read, he cannot become a citizen. Why should we have a literacy test for citizenship and not for immigration unless we wish to encourage the coming here of the foreigners to remain as a foreigner until he desires to return? Note the 400,000 foreigners who returned to fight the battle of their rulers. Do we mean to encourage that sort of immigration? If so, why? Let those who favor such immigration contemplate the effect upon our standard of living among those who toil. Members of the house, whatever else we do to maintain our ideals of citizenship, our standards of living, we must not by law permit such an incubus to be fastened upon those who toil. Our purpose here should be to insure advance of these people, not retrogression.

While the literacy test, as I said before, is not a conclusive test, it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, to listen to some of the utterances in the discussion of this bill, where we hear members compare the viciousness of some educated men with the virtues of some of those who cannot read, we wonder in what land this discussion is carried on. How account for these enormities upon ignorance and these invectives upon intelligence?

This bill demands that our standards of life shall not be lowered. It demands that our requirements for Americans must not be discriminated against in favor of immigrants. It demands that our unskilled labor shall not be too greatly increased. It demands that the problem of unemployment shall not be further confused by indiscriminate immigration. It demands a premium upon energy and intelligence.

Mr. Denison, Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the literacy test provided in this bill is either arbitrary or unfair. It is in keeping with our ideals. Education is the very foundation of our public. We have made it compulsory in nearly all, if not all, of the states of the Union. We compel our own people to acquire at least some education. Why should we not require it of those who would come here from other lands? This country will not suffer by the exclusion of those who could not pass the literacy test provided by this bill. If it becomes a law the requirements will soon become known in other lands, and those who would really want to come to America will prove they would be worthy of citizenship in a Republic—would soon learn to read and write well enough to pass the literacy test. Others we do not want.

I can not but admire the sentiments of those who still cling with a most tenacious fetichism to the old doctrine that America is an asylum for the oppressed and its doors must be left open for the free entry of any who would come from the four corners of the earth. That idea belonged to former generations. It is a beautiful thought, but in the practical application of it to the conditions of our day, with our hundred millions of people, it is the height of folly to our own preservation and the perpetuity of our institutions and ideals. No one claims that ignorance is necessarily an indication of dishonesty or undesirability. It seems distressingly fanciful to me to refer with pitying contempt to our forefathers who could not read or write as an argument against the literacy test.

Mr. McKenzie, Illinois.

I intend to support this bill because the class of immigrants it is intended to prevent from coming here, by their ways and manner of living, tend to lower the standard of American labor, and by this statement I do not simply men the lowering of the wage of labor, but also the social tone or standard of labor. I am inclined to think no one will dispute this. However, if such there be, permit me to ask him, if he had a son who could be considered among the high plane of labor when placed upon a public work with a number of foreign laborers, with whom he could not converse and who inhabit crowded tenements or box cars, as he were laboring alongside of one who recognize the American standard of living? I am speaking of the son who labors, not a foreman or timekeeper. Of course no one would admit such to be the fact. What has been and is the present effect on the standard of labor? Is it not a fact that as common labor is concerned upon public works in our country, the standard has fallen to a level where American refuse to engage in it, both on account of the wage and the association. All will agree that labor should be exalted, and no man should blush to admit he labors for a livelihood, and that callouses on the hands produced by honest toil should be considered badges of honor rather than disgrace. But under existing conditions the American youth feels humiliated and degraded when classed as a common laborer. Why? To my mind it is, in a great measure, due to the lowering of the standard of labor.

While it may be possible for the present generation of American boys to escape common labor, the unborn generations of the future will be unable to do so, and we should have a thought for them.

This is our country. Our posterity must abide here. Shall we consider their welfare, or shall we, unmindful of them, rush recklessly on, blocking every avenue of opportunity, and all done in the name of the downtrodden of other lands? Let us raise the standard of labor now, or at least make an effort to prevent it going still lower.

Mr. Foss, Illinois.

We impose restrictions on immigration against the physically, mentally, and morally unsound, and why should we not place a restriction in the matter of illiteracy, knowing that its effect will be to keep out a great number of undesirable citizens who come here. It is not much of a test purely from the educational standpoint, but it is a test of aspiration, as has been well said, and I trust that it will be to the immigrant a test of inspiration. In the past the only test has been the test of respiration. American citizenship, in my judgment, is a thing to be striven for, and the more we impress that idea upon the immigrant who is about to come to this country, the higher we will value American citizenship when he gets here.

It is to my mind a dangerous situation that there are today nearly two million and a half male aliens over 21 years of age who have not taken any steps to become citizens. We have gladly in the past welcomed to this country citizens from every clime, but for my part, I am not willing much longer to throw open the doors to those who come here, and profit by their residence here, and who do not care to become identified with our country and to support and uphold its institutions.

We have treated the foreign born better than the native born. The law of the States in the Union have laws permitting aliens to vote upon filing first papers after six months' or one year's residence in the State, but when it comes to the American boy, who is born here, we require that he shall pass through the different grades of the common school and then wait until he is 21 before he can vote. Is this justice to the American youth?

Mr. Stephens, Texas.

In a word, there must be some provision to meet a serious and menacing situation jeopardizing American standards of life and American concepts of freedom. If there be any desire for further information as to the justification for the attitude of the advocates of immigration restriction along the lines now before us, or any of the report of the federal immigration commission, the report of the federal bureau of labor upon an investigation in Bethlehem, Pa., the report of the house committee giving the results of its investigation of the conditions in the steel industry (including the Stanley report), the statistics of immigration for the last 20 years, and many other sources of official and authentic information.

Mr. Howard, Georgia.

While it is true that there is a sentimental side to this question, and gentlemen have pictured the poor, ignorant immigrant knocking at our gates of opportunity, only to be refused admission, it is also true that experience is oftentimes a cruel teacher, and we know what a tax upon this country was imposed by the millions who sought our opportunities and our wages, but who had no interest other than to benefit themselves, and when satisfied returned to their native land with American-earned dollars to expend in the upbuilding of their own country.

We find that the immigrant who can add only additional ignorance to the country is undesirable until we wipe out our own illiteracy. To use a homely illustration: If I want to buy a melon to take to a friend a present of a watermelon I should at least take the precaution to "thump" it. That is the test to put to the melon to determine its fitness for consumption. So we want to "thump" the immigrant to see whether or not he is fit to assimilate with our people and learn our forms of government and become a patriotic, law-abiding citizen. Certainly gentlemen will not contend that this is asking too much of a foreigner when we are taxing our people to the limit to educate out illiteracy, so that every boy and girl in America will at least have a fair start in the race of life.

Mr. Gardner, Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot keep up a high standard of living if you do not draw good pay, and you cannot draw good pay if you are going to let into this country every day thousands of men who will go to work for less wages than you are getting. Now, that is all there is to this problem. It is a question of supply and demand of labor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my objection to this bill is that in ordinary times it will only cut down immigration by 300,000, or thereabouts. If I had my way, I should be glad to vote for a bill that would either suspend immigration altogether for the next 10 years or come mighty near it. There are 20,000,000 men mobilized in Europe. In the course of this year or next they are going to start to demobilize those 20,000,000 men. They are going to project 20,000,000 men on the ruined industries of Europe, and I have an idea that those demobilized men are going to flock to come over here in vast numbers. If we wish to keep them out, you will need some laws a mighty sight more drastic than any educational test in order to do so.

Mr. Sabath—Is the gentleman acquainted with the statistics of the immigration after the different wars of Europe?

Mr. Gardner—Yes; I looked it up last year. But the situation after the present European war will in no wise resemble the situation after the Franco-Prussian war, when the armies and populations involved were small. You might as well compare a puff engine with an ocean liner. Nevertheless, if it is true that we are not going to have immigration after this war, what is the objection to passing the bill?

Mr Quin, Mississippi.

Before the war began in Europe about 1,500,000 aliens were pouring into the United States every year. Since the war has been in progress 300,000 or 400,000 have come. Then what bloody struggle is over do you think the desire will be greatest to emigrate to the United States? I fear a great flood of immigration will then be headed this way. Our country cannot assimilate this great horde of foreigners. Who wants them to come to the United States? The great trusts, corporations, railroad companies, mine owners, and other large employers of labor. They want them here for the purpose of beating down the price of wages. They use these ignorant foreigners as sledge hammers to beat over the heads of laboring men.

The steamship companies want them to come for the profit of transporting them. The political bosses in the large cities where the ignorant element congests itself use the ignorant foreign element to carry on the nefarious work of machine and corporate domination over the people.

So for one, know that the great majority of the laboring people and the farmers of this country do not want this great flood of foreign immigration pouring into the United States. The people who study this question seriously know that such a menace unrestricted immigration is to the republic.

Some of the gentlemen who have spoken have said we should endeavor to be more solicitous about the welfare of the people of other countries than they are about the people of our own country.

Mr. Green, Iowa.

The illiterate alien comes here a stranger in a strange land, where everything is different than in his former home. The government is different, our manners are different; he does not understand our language; he is without money and has no idea what is going on. He is suspicious of everything, and has no proper way of informing himself. He is easily a victim of the every day dishonesty who have been here long enough to acquire some knowledge of our habits, customs, and language, and thus frequently becomes a victim of the vicious, the immoral, and the criminal classes. Flocking to our large cities and herding together in great masses, they neither learn nor improve. Being unskilled and unorganized, they work for low wages and American workmen and lower the standards of living.

Such, Mr. Chairman, is the effect of this alien labor which we seek to reduce by the literacy test. I know of no greater danger to our institutions than that which comes from having these great masses of illiterates crowding into our cities in such a way that we can not assimilate nor can we improve them.

Mr. Hayes, California.

The illiteracy test, so strongly objected to by some, affects only one class of people, and that is the class that is ignorant and unwilling to learn. That is all. It has been said here that there is just as much intelligence among the illiterates of Europe as there is among those who can. I deny it. I have had a large experience as an employer of labor and in living among them in my native city, and I say to you that generally in this age in our public schools the children of illiterate parents cannot read or write up to development and intelligence with the children of those who can read. The conditions of this day are very different from what they were 50, 75, or 100 years ago. Today, with all the books and newspapers in the reach of everybody, there is no excuse in most of the nations of the world for any man who comes to the years of manhood and womanhood not able to read in his own language, except his stupidity or lack of ambition.

Mr. Park, Georgia.

The distinguished chairman of the immigration committee (Mr. Burnett), in an unchallenged statement on the floor of this house, said last week that Italy had compulsory education, and that all her subjects, and that these citizens along the shores of the Mediterranean contend to per cent of illiteracy, while those of northern Italy have but 8 per cent of illiteracy. This fact establishes a condition of intelligence of these southern European people which make them undesirable for our country.

Another statement was made on the floor last Saturday and is still unchallenged—that there are 2,565,012 foreign born in this country 21 years of age and over who cannot speak English, and only 35,674 are attending public schools presumably to learn. Less than one-seventh of two and a half millions who cannot speak English are trying to learn to speak our language. That does not contain a ground for the optimist had previously formed that the great desire of immigrants who come to this land of opportunity was to educate themselves and their children and to become good and true Americans. Then, if these facts go unchallenged they be admitted, as I assume they are admitted, then there is little in the argument that they seek to become good American citizens, and certainly we desire no others.

Mr. Smith, Michigan.

Why talk about compulsory school laws? And why talk about forcing men to acquire an education? Because it makes men better every way and we believe in the hands of the people. Education makes for good citizenship and good government. While there are good citizens who cannot read or write, they would not be any worse off if they could. How are they to become citizens before the court if they can neither read nor write? We should have high standard for our citizenship.

Some think illiteracy should not be the sole test. Well, it will be better if it were one of the tests. Two months at night school or a few months' study at home at night will qualify one on this simple requirement. It is highly to be earnestly desired that employers and many of our leading institutions furnish schooling to their workmen.

Mr. Nicholls, South Carolina.

I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. Sabath) in his statement that "in so far as there has been any evidence on the question recently," the fact that Taft ran third and Wilson first "indicates what the people want." That, however, is true merely of presidential candidates. Far more indicative of what the people think and want, however, is the fact that each succeeding congress, fresh from the people and their sentiments, has voted in both branches and debated and passed by large votes, passes it by an overwhelming majority. Like Banquo's ghost it will not down, and as sure as the sun rises and sets and rivers run, there is only one way to solve this question, and, ultimately, make this needed legislation law.

DIVISION OUR DANGER

Organized labor cannot advance except through the common action of the workers.

The real test is the extent in which it has succeeded in enlisting in its ranks the workers regardless of the community.

Nothing can take the place of organization.

The business of those entrusted with the affairs of the labor movement is to get the largest possible number of workers into the labor organizations.

The official or agent who is neglecting this for any cause is a failure.

The organized labor movement that the thing they have most to fear is organization, and so they do their utmost to prevent it.

They keep the members and their official representatives busy with duties that have no particular advantage to the movement.

They lead them off with false political issues.

They inspire dissatisfaction with the methods and agencies that are most active and effective in the work of organization.

Anything to keep back the real progress of organized labor.—Los Angeles Citizen.

PREJUDICE IS AN EVIL.

Progress can not be made by being guided by prejudices or impulses. Sound, unbiased reasoning is the only means to ride in the race for justice. Demagogues and hypocrites always take the easiest way of misleading the masses of the crowd without regard for the merit of their assertions, so that there is no reasoning out our own problems, viz.: To avoid the errors of the past is the part the genius of the self-seeker, and to insure justice for all. There is no place of honor in the labor movement for the shirker and more than there is for the hypocrite. Activity and honesty are prime requisites of success in this great economic movement.—Labor Clarion.

HOW EACH UNIONIST CAN HELP.

If you want to see organized labor continue to grow in strength and numbers as it should, be ready to tell the non-union man the benefits of organization. Make him see what good organization has accomplished for you and your fellow workmen. Let him see that you are sincere in your belief in the organization that has done so much for you.—Ex.

Danger that is gone is a guide post to safety.

CAN YOU THINK ?

Do you think? Try it! How?

Concentrate your thoughts upon a single subject for thirty seconds, one minute, two minutes, five minutes.

It is not so easy.

Ideas and notions which fill canvas the mind at other moments. They come and go in a second without leaving the slightest impression and in most instances are worthless.

These elusive mental stars, like an electric flash, flit across the mental blue; hide and seek between dormant brain cells.

When one of these ideas comes shooting like a sunbeam through the dark and dreary caves underneath your skull—grab it. Get to the spot with chains of thought.

Revolve it around for a few seconds over that mysterious territory of hills and dales called the cerebrum, until it finds a place to locate and rest and recuperate. Ideas are nearly all good, but they must be nursed and warmed by thought into life and full fruition.

Clear thinking is a rare and priceless jewel. Nothing can withstand it. Adamant and impregnable, steel and steel-crystallized, tempered thought cuts, pulverizes and annihilates like fire.

If the toilers could only learn to think, they would talk less and live more.

If they could organize their minds in unison the same thoughts the result is unity and united mass action.

Then the shackles and slaves for freedom. Yet, labor cannot hope to gain much greater success than it has gained until labor severs the shackles which bind the mind. Crystalized and unified thought will accomplish this revolution of minds and achieve the solidarity and unity required in the uplift of mother labor.—Journal of Electrical Workers.

Think with your brothers and sisters—think of the brave-winners and workers of the world—of the world's heavily laden.

Child of labor, think why were you given power to think.—From "Organized Labor." San Francisco.

PURPOSE OF TRADE UNIONISM

The workers, men and women alike, are exactly what their environments make them. The trade unions in their right for higher wages, shorter hours of labor and more humane working conditions are seeking to create those better environments, which mean so much for the moral and social up-lift and advancement of the race.—Ex.

Nothing is easier to understand than how we couldn't make the mistakes we see other people make.

Urge Your Two Senators to Vote for the Immigration Bill at this Session

Railroad Employes and Farmers Favor Immigration Restriction

Railroad train service employes and the millions of organized farmers have repeatedly declared for immigration restriction and their representatives are co-operating with the American Federation of Labor to secure the enactment into law of the Burnett immigration bill.

On January, when the house committee on immigration held public hearings on this measure, the A. F. of L. was represented by Secretary Frank Morrison; the railroad men by Val Fitzpatrick, vice president and national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the organized farmers by J. H. Kimble, national legislative representative of the Farmers' National Congress.

Val Fitzpatrick also spoke on behalf of these legislative colleagues:

H. E. Wills, assistant grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

P. McNamara, vice president, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

W. G. Clark, Order of Railway Conductors.

The railway employes' spokesman referred to a resolution passed on Nov. 20, 1915, at a meeting of the executive boards of the four railway brotherhoods, when it was unanimously agreed that we indorse the bill on this subject (immigration restriction) approved by the American Federation of Labor." Mr. Fitzpatrick told the committee that "our members have no guaranty that they are going to remain as engineers, firemen and brakemen," and that the railroads annually dismiss between 30,000 and 40,000 train service men and these workers are forced to enter other industries, where wages are often found to be lower and a large number of illiterates. The speaker read numerous resolutions passed by the various railroad brotherhoods in favor of immigration restriction and the literacy test.

Speaking for the organized farmers, J. H. Kimble denied that agriculturalists favor unlimited immigration. He said:

"The farmers' organizations—and I am an actual farmer and live on a farm and make a living out of a farm—are opposed to any attempt to distribute the present immigration until the laws are stiffened up. * * * There is no demand among the farmers of the country for aliens unable to speak our language or to read their own. A glance at the last annual report of the bureau of immigration which, by the way, gives many reasons for adopting the literacy bill, shows that very few 'farmers' are coming to this country. Out of a total immigration last year of 434,344 aliens only 8,215 were 'farmers,' and only 29,247 could be classified as 'farm laborers.' Very few 'farmers' or 'farm laborers' come to this country. That is one important reason why distribution of immigration is a failure. Another reason is that the farmers do not want and can not use the bulk of the kind that comes."

TRUSTS ARE PROTECTED FROM FOREIGN PRODUCTS BUT DEMAND AN UNLIMITED FLOW OF CHEAP LABOR WHICH DESTROYS AMERICAN WAGES AND IDEALS

---Frank Morrison, Secretary A. F. of L.

A high tariff against European cheap labor products is insisted upon by American trusts, but these trusts are the chief opponents of immigration restriction intended to protect American workers, said Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, at a recent hearing on the literacy legislation before the A. F. of L. official declared that American manhood can not compete with the living standards of eastern Europe and Asia and that it "is unwise to expect them to resist the tidal waves of Slav and oriental onslaught." He further said:

The proposition to prohibit immigration to the United States of able-bodied men and women because they can not read has a sympathetic viewpoint, where individuals are considered; but, approached from a viewpoint, the American Federation of Labor, which represents the organized workers of the country, and which is the only labor or organization or agency which can with any justification or reason represent the unorganized workers, has repeatedly declared by resolutions in conventions "that the literacy test is the most practical means of restricting the present immigration of cheap labor whose competition is so ruinous to the workers already here, whether native or foreign."

A great deal has been said and published in an endeavor to create the impression that it is necessary to induce immigration to come to this country for the purpose of securing agricultural workers. There is no question, in my mind, but that such legislation has for its purpose the enticing of immigrants to our country to supply the United States Steel Corporation, the great manufacturing concerns, the coal mines, packing houses, and railroads with men willing to work at a cheaper wage than those who are born here.

The opponents of the test assert the argument that common laborers would belong to the class that could not pass the literacy test, and that this country is very much in need of that particular kind of labor.

The great industrial companies of this country have more men today than they can employ, but they want two men for every job. They know that the workers must work to live and their necessities will force them to accept any wage set by the companies. Hence the workers' wages are literally held below a living wage by the hunger, misery and distress of the unemployed.

The organized wageworkers have declared in favor of restriction of immigration to maintain unlowered the American standard of life. Those who oppose restriction are representatives of companies and associations composed of employers of labor, individuals desirous of making a dollar, and associations that depend for their existence upon contributions from the employing class.

They feel that a reduction of immigration will result in a higher wage for their workers which will disturb the profits and dividends from products manufactured by them, and perhaps they have been informed that if the steamship companies do not receive $60,000,000 a year for transporting aliens they will raise their freight rates.

This reason will account in a great measure for the opposition of societies of various nationalities composed wholly or partly of business men and the attorneys of business men. Restrictions may interfere with their profits.

To oppose any attempt to lower the standards of American life. We want to raise them, and we are opposed to the exploitation of millions of aliens with its attending evils to swell the profits of the steamship companies, even if it adds to the resources of those companies $60,000,000 a year, even if it enables the United States Steel Trust to pay dividends and interest on $400,000,000 of bonds and stock which never cost that company one cent.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that industry is protected by a tariff, but labor is not; that the products of labor are protected, but we have a free flow of labor coming to our shores all the time; that manufacturers have protection against products manufactured by cheap labor in foreign countries, but labor has practically no protection against the importation of cheap labor.

The opponents of this measure say that if the products of labor are protected, that labor itself cannot be benefited, because the manufacturer can sell the products at a much higher price than he can be obtained in other countries and will be in a position to pay higher wages to his employes. The protected manufacturer does receive a higher price than the products can be sold for in other countries; and the second contention is true, they are made able to pay higher wages to their employes—is also true, but the fact is they do not pay higher wages. They pay lower wages.

We find that the most highly protected industries, particularly the industries that are now controlled by trusts, such as the steel trust, rubber trust, sugar trust, packing houses, and textile industry, pay to their employes the lowest wage in the country, and some of them less than a living wage for a family. A high tariff has nothing to do with the wages in these industries.

We hold that limitation of immigration to our country will compel the trusts to employ workers from the countries from which the immigrants flow. The fact that these countries have an outlet for a great number of their people means that there is an outlet from the oppressive conditions in these countries. For that reason those countries delay social and industrial reforms. As a consequence industrial and social misery is perpetuated in those countries because their citizens are induced to come to this country.

The wage earners believe in an effective regulation of immigration, because they desire to retain the American standard of living. The standard of wages for both skilled and unskilled labor in this country is the result of many years' effort by organized labor. When an immigrant accepts work at less than the standard wage he not only takes the place of a man working at a higher rate but he assists in forcing down the prevailing rate of wages in that industry, which result carries with it a corresponding reduction in the physical, moral, and intellectual standard of American life.

In support of my statement that the American worker can not compete with this induced immigration and support his family on the wages paid, I refer you to the investigation of the Bethlehem steel works made by a committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, representing over 16,000,000 people in this country. It is reported that immigrant parents send their children back to the old country to be reared while the mother goes to work. On such a wage basis American standards are impossible.

The literacy test is an expedient which should be adopted now, and time and experience will demonstrate what further legislation will be necessary in the interest and for the safety of the American people, for the improvement of American citizenship and homes, and for the perpetuation of the American standard of life.

The American Federation of Labor, at its convention held last November, in San Francisco, by unanimous action reiterated and indorsed the previous conventions urging the speedy enactment into law of the immigration bill containing the literacy test.

No other single proposed addition to our immigration laws has received the indorsement accorded to the literacy test.

Opponents of Immigration Bill Did Not Divide on Party Lines

Opposition to the Burnett immigration bill, which passed the house, March 30, by a vote of 307 to 87, was of a nonpartisan character.

On the Democratic side Congressmen Sabath of Illinois and Gallivan of Massachusetts were leaders in the fight in the cause of cheap labor advocates. In one of Mr. Gallivan's fervent pleas he declared: "Men who have fought for this, our land its most vital necessity—strong, vigorous, simple, God-fearing peasants."

Mr. Sabath insisted that "reports which have been circulated declaring there is an imperative need for immigration legislation are unfounded and unjustifiable."

Congressman London, Socialist, opposed the bill. Over one-half of the Friday, March 24, speech of this attorney was devoted to an arraignment of the trade union movement. In a tone that sounded like a spokesman for the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. London said:

"The trouble with the average representative of organized labor is that he is incapable of that broader vision which is the crying need of the moment and of the moment. That is the misfortune of the trade union movement. What lack of intelligence! The politician is afraid to tell them that they are stupid."

Mr. London is a socialist. Mr. London said he assumed employes in Youngstown steel mills were unorganized, and then made this reference to the trade union movement:

"But if they were not organized it was the fault of the narrowness of the trade union movement that does not know how to reach the masses."

Mr. London is evidently unacquainted with the spy systems of large corporations, with the constant agitation by the American Federation of Labor to organize the unskilled, and with the number of unionists who have been slugged by the corporation thugs to prevent organization. He said:

"The union would greet the immigrant as a brother. The union man should teach him unionism. Instead of that, the union man looks upon every immigrant as an enemy."

Despite this attorney's claim that he represents the workers, he made it clear that he would be the sole judge of what was best fitted for them. In his second reference to the alleged stupidity of workers, he said:

"I have no faith in the friend of labor who encourages every stupid demand of the worker, checking at the same time every real aspiration of the working class for a greater share in life's joys."

On the Republican side, Congressmen Joseph Cannon of Illinois, Bennet of New York and Moore of Pennsylvania were the leading opponents of restriction.

In referring to the literacy test, Mr. Moore said:

"It casts down utterly the toiler who struggles patiently and laboriously under the burdens imposed upon him by the strong and the heartless."

Mr. Cannon is president of the National Liberal Immigration league, which was exposed last year by Preston Gompers, who showed that this league was financed by steamship companies, steel, mine and coal companies and other organizations that cheap labor interests. The documents made public by President Gompers proved that this alleged philanthropic organization was the vehicle through which cheap labor advocates opposed immigration restriction. It was also shown that the league's financed delegates to various nationalities to Washington, and that the delegates were not selected by the organizations they alleged to represent.

Congressman Bennet, another active opponent of restriction, was the president of the National Liberal Immigration league. In the Congressional Record of February 25, 1915, Mr. Bennet is quoted:

"While I was out of the house, amongst my clients were some steamship companies, and I studied the immigration restriction) some more."

Mr. Bennet was a member of the United States immigration commission that investigated this question for nearly two years. He was the only member of the commission that dissented from a literacy test and other restrictions favored by his colleagues on the commission.

As an attorney, he is most versatile, acting not only as defender for the steamship companies, but for contract labor law violators. In the March 25 Congressional Record he is quoted:

"The department of justice collects thousands of dollars (from violators of the contract labor law). While I was out of congress on a temporary vacation I represented a gentleman who had to walk up to the people's office and pay $6,000 in one of these cases."

WHAT LABOR EXPECTS FROM OUR COURTS

(By John P. Frey, Editor Iron Molders' Journal).

As society and industry are organized today the individual is helpless. The problems which affect the several groups in society can only be worked out through collective effort, and labor has the right to expect that as the industrial problems are worked out, labor shall have the privilege will be allowed to any one group which is not fully granted to the others.

Labor believes that the courts should act aside as antiquated, impractical and unjust much of the common law based upon judicial precedents which are established at a time when the conception of the relationship between employers and workmen differed from what it is at present.

We have passed the time of owner and slave; the implication contained in the term "master and servant," as applied years ago is repugnant to our present conception of the workers' rights as free men and citizens.

The industrial condition today, which forces the workmen to depend upon the owners or controllers of tools and capital, for labor and wages differs as much from the former condition which existed, as our steam railways contrast with the period when overland transporation was by stagecoach and turnpike. Instead of depending upon individual employers who at a period when conditions were far different than at present, labor expects of the American courts that in the first of all make a study of the actual conditions affecting labor today, and that necessary for the courage to establish precedents by their present decisions which will aim toward establishing equality of rights, privileges and opportunities under conditions which affect the workers today.

If the workers who compose the great mass of our people are to make progress, they must work out their salvation largely through their own initiative. They must abandon the notion that labor as wholly inadequate, and instead use their efforts collectively. If they are to have an adequate voice in establishing the terms and conditions under which their labor shall be performed, they must do this through collective action; they must establish democracy in the industries so that government in the shop, like government in the nation, shall be through and by the consent of the governed.

Three great struggles have taken place among mankind to establish those conditions of liberty which would make men truly free. Religious liberty and political liberty have been firmly established in the progressive and civilized nations of the earth. Industrial liberty still remains more of a shadow than a substance for a large portion of the wage-earners, and it is unfortunate that many of the wage-earners' efforts to establish a necessary degree of industrial liberty have been frustrated through judicial decisions which seemingly have for their foundation the belief that industrial liberty proved to accomplish by freeing itself was an interference with or an injury to some property right of the employer. Under that theory of industrial liberty, call it by any term we wish, the condition where the workmen's welfare is of as much importance as the rights or capital or property, is conspicuous by its absence. Labor has the right to expect that our courts will not retard rather than retard the growth and the application of the principles of democracy in the industries.

CARPENTERS ADVANCE.

Indianapolis, April 8.—General Secretary Duffy of the Brotherhood of Carpenters reports that the following locals have been organized during the month of March:

Trenton, N. J.; New York city (furniture workers); Grey Bull, Wyo.; Dewar, Okla.; Safety Harbor, Fla.; New York city (shop carpenters, exclusive); Columbia, S. C.; Duluth, Minn. (cabinet makers and millmen); Seguin, Tex.; Cleveland, Ohio (floor layers); Mt. Kinghurst, Tenn.; Emporium, Pa.; Raleigh, N. C.; Great Bend, Kan.; Rittman, Ohio; Atkinson, Miss.; Stevens Point, Wis.; Augusta, Kan., and Stamford, Conn. (boat builders).

Carpenters at Champaign and Urbana, Ill., have increased wages from 50 to 55 cents per hour to take effect May 1.

At Madison, Wis., the Carpenters' union has signed a three-year agreement with wage increases from 40 to 45 cents per hour for shopmen, and from 45 to 47 1-2 cents per hour for outside men from April 1, 1916, to May 1, 1918, and 50 cents per hour from January 1, 1918, to April 1, 1919.

New Rochelle, N. Y., Carpenters' union raised wages 30 cents per day, making the present rate $4.80.

SEAMEN'S ACT DEFENDED.

Milwaukee, April 8.—In a speech in this city United States Senator La Follette defended the seamen's act and said the reason American boys are quitting the sea is because foreigners compete with the $8 a month wage paid to Orientals.

"Every line of the bill is in the interest of the American boy," he said, and for justice to the American seaman," he said. "There was only one small body of men affected by it, and ours who had not the protection of the American government to the constitution. Do you know that every American seaman sailing the high seas was subject to imprisonment if he quit work? Think of it for just one moment. Do you know what the effect was? It was driving every American boy from the love for the sea to find something else, with the result that American sailors were supplanted by Japanese, Chinese and men from the Mediterranean who could be employed at $8 a month."

URGE INCREASED WAGES

Washington, April 8.—Increased wages for charwomen and laborers in the custodian service of the government are urged by Secretary Flaherty of the National Federation of Postoffice Clerks and President James Wilson of the A. F. of L. Federal Labor union of civil service employes of San Francisco, before the house committee on appropriations. The unionists asked that the wages of the charwomen, who now receive $300 yearly, be increased $20 monthly, and that an $840 yearly minimum be established for janitors, janitresses and janitors. There are 5,000 employes in the custodian service now receiving less than $1 per day. Increased wages while employes doing the humbler tasks are neglected.

NEWS FROM FALL RIVER.

Fall River, Mass., April 8.—The Carpenters' District Council and a committee from the Builders' association is conferring on a new wage scale.

Painters and decorators will ask for a wage increase of 5 cents an hour. Refusal to grant this increase caused a strike about two years ago, which was never officially declared off. Those strikers have strengthened their union and declare that the new rate must take effect May 1.

Striking iron molders employed at the Milburn-Lincoln plants have modified in their demand for wage rates conceded by other employers.

WRECKING MEN'S LIVES.

Tacoma, Wash., April 8.—Kitchens in restaurants in this city are "operated" by men's lives, declares the Cooks and Waiters' union, in its appeal for assistance to the Industrial Relations commission that they contemplate such action.

The commission investigated the machinists' demands and agreed that their demands were "just." Then the machinists struck to enforce their new rates, which have now been accepted by practically every contract shop in the city.

"Un-American" Is Familiar Plea of Reform Legislation Opponents

(Editorial in The Unpopular Review, January, 1916.)

The assertion that the literacy test is un-American is one which has been urged against many measures of social betterment which have been directed against any proposition which involves departing from traditional methods or policies. In other words, which recognizes that the world moves and conditions change. When policemen were first introduced into the streets of the United States, the innovation was bitterly opposed on the ground that it was un-American to interfere with the natural rights of the individual. The "penalty clause" in the early elevators of the middle west maintain themselves has been attacked as un-American, because it tends to exclude aliens on the basis of opportunity, not of character. Illiteracy, it is maintained, is not a test of ability but of early opportunity. But a test based on opportunity, is not un-American. For our immigration law already contains a number of tests which rest, in part at least, on opportunity. Such are the tests excluding paupers, those likely to become public charges, persons with contagious diseases, etc. In fact, when the individual immigrant appears before the inspector little can be gained by attempting to separate those deficiencies which are due to native ability from those which are traceable to environment. The only way to judge a man is on the grounds of his fitness.

In pursuance of the "un-American" argument, however, it is further urged that illiteracy cannot reasonably be considered a test of fitness for American life, because this nation was founded by illiterates, and that it has nevertheless done pretty well as a nation. Now this argument is that it is not true, and that if it were, it proves too much. It does not prove that equal ignorance that this nation was founded by men who made their living by slave labor in the south and the sea and the trade in the north, and that therefore these good old institutions should have been preserved. At such arguments Anacon the fact that the world has progressed during the past three centuries, and that conditions are very different things now from what it did in the days of the Pilgrim fathers or of the revolutionary heroes.

Another argument which proves too much is that produced so triumphantly and with so great effect in some such words as these: "This measure would keep at a great many people who would be very useful citizens. If it had been in force in earlier years, it would have kept out the mother of Abraham Lincoln, who signed her name with a cross." Certainly the literacy test would keep out some people who would be useful citizens in many, if not most, of the tests now in force. The futility of such arguments may be illustrated by one different thing and absurdum. "Booker T. Washington was one of the most useful citizens of the United States. His ancestors on one side were brought over as negro slaves. Therefore it was a mistake to abolish the slave trade."

Such are the arguments of the opponents of the literacy test. To answer these, their efforts are devoted to countering the claims of the opposite side, rather than to showing that it has been successfully only with respect to the strictly and temporarily economic assimilation of a large body of alien fortune by questionable and probably dangerous means. There are those who do not regard this as an argument against the literacy test, but for it.

The matter can be rightly understood only by taking the broadest possible view of the relations, not of this generation alone but of the generations to come. The natural destiny of the United States is to be the leader of the nations into the new development of the common people. Our duty is to set standards, not to distribute the natural advantages which we have enjoyed. We cannot render service to mankind by hastily and inconsiderately yielding to the demands of specious humanitarianism and dissipating today what should be the heritage of future generations.

In industry is denied him he has not attained the kind of liberty that is really worth while.—Los Angeles Citizen.

ROOM FOR ALL.

There is room in the organized labor movement for every man or woman who is honorably employed for wages. The movement is to the interests to see that the message of collective effort is carried to these people in every community and that they are given a hearty welcome to our ranks.—Ex.

SELF-EDUCATION BEST

"Every man who rises above the common level has received two educations," says Gibbon, "the first from his teachers, the second from himself."

Upon a thorough investigation it will be found that, practically without exception, it is the second education—that is the personally acquired one—which alone has possessed the stability and worth. Moreover, we shall find that there are powerful physical and psychological factors behind these facts; factors at least very similar to, if not completely identical with, those which we find constantly operating in all the tissues of all organisms, whether it be in the gum and teeth, the heart, or other organs of man.

We shall find, too, that this keen insight into the meaning of life's problems is the perfectly sound and fundamental biological law; namely, that every organism must attain its fullest development and individually work out its own destiny, be that what it may. Arbitrary interference with functions inevitably tends to destroy them, because functions and structures are correlated only—neither can be able to exist in the absence of the other.

The first place this primary education represents something which is in the nature of a gift: something that is done for the individual, but has no direct opposition to his real desires and in return for which necessarily no really adequate compensation or adjustment is achieved. Under these conditions it is that England, the United States, Russia to function, and this tends to defeat its purpose, for the reason that it contributes to the gradual atrophy of the reaction actually sought for.

The education acquired by oneself has proven to be the most beneficial, because in its acquisition the individual followed his desires, and consequently there was normal functioning of organisms both physical and mental. It is only by this process that the highest development can be attained. This is proven by the achievement of some of the greatest men in history, who became great only after a period of self-education.—United Mine Workers' Journal.

In Labor's Trenches

Press reports of the war are replete with lines telling of the alertness of the soldiers in the trenches and on the line of march.

They should be a lesson to the workers in the industrial war on the job.

Indeed, too often our war is nothing more formidable than a little duel of chatter at the enemy and its tactics.

Some are stern days in the struggles of the workers.

They are days that call for supreme alertness, courage and devotion.

The trenches must be guarded and enlarged and extended.

The line of march must be steady, intelligent and determined.

Organization! That is the word.

Organize the men and women of labor.

Organize the purpose of labor.

Organize the equipment and resources of labor.

Organize the ideals and principles of labor.—Los Angeles Citizen.

TRADE UNIONISM LEADS.

Toronto, Ont., April 8.—"One only needs to understand the great principles for which trade unionism has always stood," says the Labor Industrial Banner, "when single handed it has had to fight for reforms before they are in accordance with the fully realize the broadness of its democracy and the great influence it has exercised for good in the world. Wherever organized labor has agitated for and secured shorter hours of labor, higher rates of wages, and has earnestly improved the industrial conditions of the army of toilers, it has also championed those principles of reform that must inevitably evolve a wider and a freer social atmosphere.

Viewed in the light of what it actually advocates and stands for, the democracy of the trade union movement is not even open to question. Labor always has been, and is today, a leader in the great battle for equity, liberty and real reform."

CAR MEN RAISE WAGES.

Des Moines, Iowa, April 8.—Motormen and conductors employed by the Des Moines City Railway company will be granted the following wage increases: From April 1, 1916, to April 1, 1917, 27 and 31 cents an hour; from April 1, 1917 to 1918, 27, 28 and 32 cents an hour, and from 1918 to 1918, 28, 29 and 33 cents an hour.

The former rates were 25 cents for the first year, 26 cents for the second year and 30 cents thereafter. Wages of barn and shopmen and other employes are also increased.

EXPOSITION RECEIPTS LARGE.

San Francisco, April 8.—Final certified statement of the revenue of the Panama-Pacific exposition show that the grand total of receipts for admissions and concessions was $11,254,606.

Paid admissions amounted to $4,715,522, and the gross receipts from concessions were $7,809,084. The net revenue from concessions were $1,530,331. The statements show that concessions offering food, rent and shelter yielded a greater revenue than the amusement concessions.

PRINTERS RAISE WAGES.

Boston, April 8.—The Typographical union and typothetae of Greater Boston have signed a five-year agreement which carries the same arbitration provisions that prevail in the newspaper industry. Wages are raised to a total of $2 a week (now $1.50 and $2.50 for women) during the life of the contract. The union is striving to secure women on the same wage standard as men, which has not been the case in some instances in this city.

FAVORS VACATIONS.

Albany, N. Y., April 8.—Assemblyman Hone has introduced an amendment to the public officers' law which makes mandatory the provision giving each employe of the state a two weeks' vacation annually.

TEXAS TEAMSTERS ADVANCE.

Fort Worth, April 8.—A few months ago the Teamsters' union consisted of a handful of members. These workers, however, awakened to their poor conditions and began an agitation that has resulted in securing contracts with leading fer companies. After securing a 100 per cent organization in this branch of their organization they recently voted that they will secure 100 members every month until next August.

TO ORGANIZE UNSKILLED.

Sacramento, Cal., April 8.—At the annual convention of the State Building Trades Council it was decided to inaugurate an active campaign for the organization among the unskilled and migratory workers of California.

The convention instructed its officers to petition congress to pass a law permitting school trustees to borrow money on the property of the school districts for the purpose of erecting public schools.

LITERACY TEST FAVORED.

Albany, N. Y., April 8.—The railroad committee of the assembly favored the literacy test bill for steam railroad employes handling trains, tracks and switches.

Some legislators have expressed surprise that a railroad will employ persons for this work who cannot read. The railroad brotherhoods are urging that the bill be passed.

COMPENSATION ACT UPHELD.

San Francisco, April 8.—A majority of the state supreme court has ruled that the workmen's compensation law is constitutional. This gives to the aliens of compensation by the industrial accident commission, to dependents of employes accidentally killed. The court had previously ruled that the commission could award compensation to injured living employes.

THE PACKERS' "GENEROSITY."

The St. Louis packers have raised the wages of their employes $30,000 a week. Sounds big, doesn't it? But it is only $30,000 of them, and this is the first raise in eighteen years.

Meanwhile cost of living has risen by not less than 50 per cent. The packers take great credit for allowing this advance.

Their generosity seems to have been influenced by their previous enormous profits. But a dollar a week will pay for considerable land, if one can't afford butter, on the San Francisco Star.

OPPOSITION IS EXPECTED.

The labor movement, like every other movement that moves, is subject to a good deal of opposition, particularly from those who stand still and sneer. Probably the mule who looks over the fence and wobbles over at the hitching express has a rather small opinion of railroad speed.—Coast Seamen's Journal.

If experience cannot teach a man there is no hope for him.

WHY OPPOSITION IS PASSING

It is a fact, that where formerly almost everyone was more or less opposed to the unions, the general sentiment of the whole country is undergoing a change. Men who a few years ago were most bitter opponents of the unions, are today advocating that the unions be given an opportunity to work out the true democracy for which they stand. American ideals stand for a democracy; a democracy is that form of government which guarantees to all the equal rights and liberties to the man who have the welfare of the nation at heart are coming to realize that trade unions stand for the equal opportunity for all," and that instead of being the "unreasoning monster" as it was formerly considered, the labor union is far more reasonable in its demands and more inclined to grant a measure of justice, than is the representative of capital, who still clings to the idea that labor is a commodity and that capital is for sale at the lowest possible figure, to insure them big profits, and who totally disregard the human factor in the matter.

The opposition is passing because the unions have proven that it is getting a better education in the principles of democracy, and has brought a good fight has climbed over obstacles apparently insurmountable at one time, and has pioneered the way for reforms to the ideal upon which the government was founded; this education has developed powerful leaders who have equal opportunities and taught them the lesson, that to benefit themselves self-sacrifice is necessary, and that to insure the fulfillment of present promises, it is necessary to remember that, as in the past, it is the concern of all.—Oklahoma Federationist.

INSIST THAT THE IMMIGRATION BILL BE PASSED AT THIS SESSION

Urge Your Two Senators, at Washington, to Favor Immediate Action on This Measure. Restriction Will Protect American Workers' Living Standards. Insist That This Bill Be Passed Before Congress Adjourns